

posuit.

Concilium florentinum



Georgius Hofmann, S.J.

Acts of Florence, vol. 6

translated by Havoc using Sonnet 4.5

(Translated by CatholicHavoc)

Substack: substack.com/@catholichavoc

X: x.com/CatholicHavoc

COUNCIL OF FLORENCE
DOCUMENTS AND WRITERS

GEORGIUS HOFMANN, S.J.

Vol. 6

**THE COUNSEL AND AT THE EXPENSE OF THE PONTIFICAL
INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL STUDIES**

LATIN ACTS OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

1955

INTRODUCTION.....	11
DEDICATION OF THE WORK.....	86
PUBLIC COLLOQUIA OF FERRARA.....	131
Conciliar Session, 9 (8) October 1438.....	140
SPEECH OF THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF NICAIA.....	143
RESPONSE OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF COLOCENSIS TO THE SPEECH OF THE NICENE.....	149
THE SECOND BOOK BEGINS, IN WHICH THE GREEKS BEGIN THE COLLOQUIA WITH THE LATINS, AND THE CHOICE HAVING BEEN GIVEN.....	153
COLLOQUY OF THE SECOND DAY, THE THIRTEENTH OF THE SAME MONTH. THE CARDINAL. COLOCENSIS. THE PROVINCIAL. THE EPHESIAN. THE NICENE.....	156
THIRD COLLOQUY HELD ON THE SIXTEENTH OF OCTOBER.....	159
FOURTH ASSEMBLY HELD ON THE TWENTIETH OF OCTOBER.....	164
SIXTH COLLOQUY, ON THE FIRST OF NOVEMBER.....	165
SEVENTH COLLOQUY, 4 NOVEMBER.....	173
COLLATIO VIII — 8 NOVEMBER.....	184
Response to the Principal Arguments.....	185
The Filioque Is Not a Prohibited Addition.....	186
Virtual Containment: New Testament in Old.....	186
The Authority of Cyril and the Intent of the Legislators.....	187
Evidence from the Acts of the Councils.....	188
On the Letter of Celestine and the Apostles' Creed.....	189
Returning to the Main Argument.....	190
On the License to Add and the Fear of Syllables.....	190
Third Argument: The Authority of Cyril to Acacius.....	191
Exchange Regarding the Text of Cyril's Letter.....	192
Fourth Argument: Theotokos and the Two Natures.....	192
The Fifth Principal Argument: The Works of the Fathers.....	194
The Sixth Principal Argument: Logic and the Filioque.....	194
Refutation Using Proper Logical Terms.....	195
Further Clarification and Logical Defense.....	196
The Lord of Kolossi Was Right.....	198
Closing Exchange.....	199
ACTUS NONUS — 11 NOVEMBER.....	199
Opening: Continuation by the Bishop of Forlì.....	199
Six Points on Principles.....	199
Response: Agreements and Disagreements on the Nature of Principles.....	201
On Necessity and Truth.....	202
The Latin Addition Is Not Extrinsic.....	203
On the Authority of the Church.....	204
Final Objection: On the Roman Church's Authority.....	206
Closing Exchange.....	208

The Cardinal on the Prohibition of the Council of Ephesus.....	208
Cyril's Letter and the Seventh Synod on the Intent of the Fathers.....	210
The Case of Pope Leo at the Council of Chalcedon.....	211
The Case of Eutyches at the Second Council of Ephesus.....	211
Response to the Claim That Private Persons May Hold Different Beliefs.....	212
The Letter of Agatho and the Sixth Council.....	212
The Word "Necessity" Not Expressed in the Prohibition.....	213
The Silence on the Constantinopolitan Creed at Ephesus.....	213
The Sixth Synod's Interpretation of the Prohibition.....	213
Recourse to the Legislator's Intent.....	214
The Synod of Chalcedon Vindicates Flavian.....	214
Conclusion of the Cardinal's Argument.....	215
Response of the Lord of Nicaea.....	216
Intervention of the Archbishop of Kolossi.....	216
ACTUS DECIMUS — 18 November.....	217
Opening Remarks of the Bishop of Forlì (Continued from Previous Session).....	217
Session of 18 November — Tenth Session.....	219
First Argument: The Case of Charisius.....	220
Cardinal's Response on the Three Causes.....	224
Further Exchange on the Nestorian Creed.....	226
Cyril's Testimony on the Prohibition.....	232
The Cardinal on Time and the Principal Question.....	234
On the Constantinopolitan Creed and Ancient Manuscripts.....	234
Closing Exchanges and Proposed Next Session.....	235
Final Address to the Pope.....	236
ACTUS DECIMUS — Second, Third, and Fourth Days of Collation.....	237
Preamble: On Leaving the Sheep to Seek the Lost.....	237
Session of 4 December — Tenth Session.....	239
THE ORATION FOLLOWS.....	240
Presuppositions and the Purpose of the Oration.....	241
On Charity as the Foundation of All Good Works.....	242
The Model of Christ and the Apostles.....	243
On Reconciliation and the Gift Left at the Altar.....	244
The Danger of Continued Division.....	245
The Duke of Burgundy's Mission.....	246
Praise of the Duke.....	247
The Glory That Would Follow.....	249
The Crusade and Liberation.....	250
ACTUS DECIMUS — Second, Third, and Fourth Days of Collation.....	251
Preamble: On Leaving the Sheep to Seek the Lost.....	251
Session of 4 December — Tenth Session.....	253

THE ORATION FOLLOWS.....	254
Presuppositions and the Purpose of the Oration.....	256
On Charity as the Foundation of All Good Works.....	257
The Model of Christ and the Apostles.....	258
On Reconciliation and the Gift Left at the Altar.....	259
The Danger of Continued Division.....	260
The Duke of Burgundy's Mission.....	261
Praise of the Duke.....	262
The Glory That Would Follow.....	264
The Crusade and Liberation.....	265
Final Praise of Charity and Concord.....	266
Return of the Greek Delegates.....	268
The Bishop of Ephesus Opens the Discussion.....	268
Reading of the Chalcedonian Text.....	272
On the Definition of a Creed.....	274
On the Distinction Between "Contrary" and "Different".....	275
Greek Perspective on "Contrary" vs. "Different".....	277
Return to the Question of Charisius.....	279
Final Exchange on Agatho's Letter.....	284
Reading of the Definition.....	286
Final Exchange: On Declarations by the Fathers.....	288
ACTUS UNDECIMUS — 8 December.....	290
Continuation from the Previous Session.....	290
The Intention of the Prohibiting Fathers.....	291
ACTUS UNDECIMUS — 8 DECEMBER.....	292
Bishop of Ephesus: The Prohibition Concerns Words as Well as Meaning.....	293
Cyril's Letter on the Immutability of the Creed.....	295
The Argument of Gregory the Theologian on the Holy Spirit.....	300
Cardinal's Response.....	301
On the Credibility of the Source.....	304
Final Arguments of the Cardinal.....	305
Final Citations and Conclusion.....	313
ACTUS XIII — THIRTEENTH OF DECEMBER.....	315
PUBLIC COLLOQUIA OF FLORENCE.....	330
On the reception of the Greeks at Florence.....	331
THE THIRTEENTH PUBLIC COLLOQUIY, HELD ON THE SECOND DAY OF MARCH....	332
On the first authority — Epiphanius.....	336
On the authority of Basil against Eunomius.....	340
On the distinction between essence and person in divine things.....	343
THE SECOND DISPUTATION AT FLORENCE.....	347
COLLATIO XX (FLORENTINA VII), 21 MARCH 1439.....	421

Part I: Arguments from Sacred Scripture.....	422
First Argument: The Spirit is Called "Spirit of the Son".....	422
Second Argument: The Spirit is Sent by the Father and by the Son.....	423
Third Argument: We are Conformed to the Son Through the Spirit.....	424
Fourth Argument: The Spirit Receives from the Son.....	424
Fifth Argument: The Son Operates Through the Spirit.....	426
Part II: Testimonies of the Latin Doctors.....	427
Pope Leo I.....	427
Pope Damasus.....	428
Hilary of Poitiers.....	429
Jerome.....	430
Ambrose of Milan.....	431
Pope Hormisdas.....	433
Gregory the Dialogist.....	434
Boethius.....	434
Isidore of Seville.....	435
The Spanish Councils.....	435
Part III: Testimonies of the Greek Doctors.....	438
Basil the Great.....	438
Epiphanius.....	439
Didymus of Alexandria.....	440
Athanasius.....	442
Cyril of Alexandria.....	446
Responses to the Arguments of the Ephesian.....	452
Response to the First Objection: "Who Proceeds from the Father".....	453
Response to the Second Objection: "The Spirit is from God".....	454
Response to the Third Objection: Cyril's Letter Beginning "Let the Heavens Rejoice".....	455
Response to the Fourth Objection: The Second Council of Constantinople.....	456
Response to the Fifth Objection: The Third Council.....	456
Acts of Florence After the Public Sessions.....	460
Agreement Between the Latins and Greeks Concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit..	462
The Greek Position.....	462
The Latin Position.....	462
The Joint Agreement.....	463
The Death of Patriarch Joseph II, 10 June 1439.....	463
Document of Agreement and the Sermon of Cardinal Julian Cesarini on Purgatory.....	465
Proof from Sacred Scripture.....	465
Proof from the Universal Custom of the Church.....	466
Proof from the Authority of the Holy Roman Church.....	467
Proof from the Fathers of the Church.....	467

Proof from Divine Justice.....	472
Documents Concerning the Addition to the Creed, the Matter for Confecting the Most Holy Eucharist, and the Primacy.....	473
Document i: On the Addition of "Filioque" to the Creed.....	473
Document ii: On the Matter for Confecting the Eucharist.....	473
Document iii: On the Primacy.....	474
Preparation for Further Discussion.....	474
First Address of John of Montenegro on the Primacy.....	475
i. The Roman Pontiff as Successor of Peter.....	475
ii. The Roman Pontiff as Vicar of Jesus Christ.....	476
SERMO PRIOR IOHANNIS DE MONTENIGRO, DE PRIMATU.....	476
First Address of John of Montenegro on the Primacy.....	476
i. The Roman Pontiff as Successor of Peter.....	477
ii. The Roman Pontiff as Vicar of Jesus Christ.....	477
iii. The Roman Pontiff as Head of the Whole Church and Father of All Christians.....	478
iv. The Roman Pontiff as Teacher of the Whole Christian Faith.....	479
v. The Primacy Over the Whole World.....	480
vi. The Power of Feeding, Ruling, and Governing the Universal Church.....	481
vii. The Plenitude of Power.....	483
First Address of John of Torquemada on the Matter and Form of the Most Holy Eucharist.	484
Part i: The Matter of the Eucharist — Unleavened and Leavened Bread.....	485
Part ii: The Form of Consecration.....	487
Arguments from Reason.....	488
Second Address of John of Montenegro on the Primacy.....	493
Preliminary Foundation: The Authority of Decretal Letters.....	493
Response to the First Objection: The Meaning of "Head," "Father," and "Teacher".....	496
The Nature of Spiritual Jurisdiction.....	498
The Power of Convening — Response to a Further Difficulty.....	499
Response to Two Objections: The Role of Emperors and the Five Patriarchs.....	500
The Patriarchs and the Primacy of Rome.....	501
Second Address of John of Torquemada on the Form of the Most Holy Eucharist.....	505
i. That This Addition Contains Truth.....	505
ii. Responses to Three Objections.....	506
iii. That the Clause Must Be Placed Out of Necessity.....	509
iv. The Utility and Charity of the Addition.....	510
Acts of 26 June 1439.....	513
Acts of 27 June 1439.....	514
Address of Cardinal Julian Cesarini, 27 June 1439.....	515
History of the Disputes.....	515
i. Purgatory.....	516

ii. The Addition to the Creed.....	516
iii. The Procession of the Holy Spirit.....	516
iv. The Addition to the Creed.....	517
v. Purgatory.....	517
vi. Unleavened and Leavened Bread.....	518
vii. The Form of Consecration.....	518
viii. The Primacy.....	519
SPEECH OF THE POPE, 27 JUNE 1439.....	521
SPEECH OF JULIAN CESARINI, CARDINAL, 4 JULY 1439.....	522
DECREE.....	526
Subscriptions of the Greeks.....	535
ON THE UNION WITH THE ARMENIANS.....	537
LETTER OF THE REGENT OF THE CITY OF CAFFA TO THE SUPREME PONTIFF.....	539

INTRODUCTION

ON THE TITLE OF THE WORK

Horatius Iustinianus (Giustiniani), the first editor of the second and third parts of the work of Andreas de Sancta Cruce (Santacroce), in which the disputations concerning the Council of Florence are recorded, inserted this work under the title *Disputations or Conferences held between the Latins and the Greeks at the General Council of Florence, written in the manner of a dialogue by Andreas de S. Cruce, Roman patrician and Advocate of the Apostolic Consistory, together with Ludovico Pontano*, in his book *Acta sacri oecumenici Concilii Florentini* (Rome, 1638). This title certainly cannot be faulted, even though it was not composed in exactly this form by the author Andreas de S. Cruce himself; for precisely the characteristic words *disputations*, and especially *conferences*, are found in the subdivisions of the work, and the word *dialogue* appears still in the dedication and after the dedication in the title of the first part, which contains the dialogue of Andreas de Sancta Cruce with Ludovico Pontano, protonotary and opponent of the Council of Florence — convoked and celebrated, as it were, by Pope Eugene IV against the will of the greater part of the synodal fathers of Basel — on the primacy of the pope.

The catalogue of the library of Pope Nicholas V contains our book under the single title *Dialogus Andreae de Sancta Cruce de ecclesiastico primatu* (Dialogue of Andreas de Sancta Cruce on Ecclesiastical Primacy). Those words added by Giustiniani to the term *disputations or conferences*, namely *held between Latins and Greeks at the General Council of Florence*, correspond well to the title of the author himself. He, at the beginning of the dedication of his work to Albert, King of the Romans, has the following: *Dialogue of Andreas de Sancta Cruce of Rome, advocate of the apostolic consistory, against Ludovico Pontano the Roman, on the primacy of the Church and the acts of the Latin and Greek fathers at the ecumenical synod of Ferrara, finally transferred to Florence, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit*. But after the dedication, the author uses a shorter title, namely *Dialogue of Lord Andreas de Sancta Cruce, consistorial advocate, and Lord Ludovico, protonotary*. In another of his books, still only partly published —

namely the *ephemeris curialis* (court diary) — he gives the dialogue this title: *liber Grecorum* (Book of the Greeks) (fol. 40v).

To this book the following note alludes (fol. 39v): *The disputation with the Greeks was begun... and in these public disputations many matters were taken up, each day individually memorable, of which I shall make no mention here, since I have written out in a separate book, as befitting a separate record of noteworthy matters, the complete series of proceedings, addressed to Emperor Albert.* Since the dialogue, as I said, is dedicated to King Albert, there is no doubt that the author was speaking of this work which we are re-editing. One might easily conclude that the author intended a similar title with the word *gesta* (acts/proceedings of the council). But a new question arises, which we are compelled to resolve from other words of the author.

Since the dialogue dedicated to King Albert (who died in October 1439) encompasses only the proceedings with the Greeks and Armenians at the Council of Florence, which were concluded in the bulls of their union on 6 July and 22 November 1439, it is remarkable that the author leaves us this note concerning the union of the Copts (Jacobites) on 4 February 1442 (fol. 46r in the Gaddian codex 48): *as we have noted and recorded in the book of the acts of the said council the account given by their orators (of the Coptic and Ethiopian delegates);* and (fol. 47v): *the sequence of this decree (of the union of the Copts) we have recorded in the book of the acts of the councils.* Also concerning other acts of the council after the union of the Greeks, Armenians (1439), and Copts (1442), the author speaks in his court diary of another of his books on the acts of the councils.

Two solutions can be given to this question. Either the author Andreas de Sancta Cruce wished to complete his work in dialogue form — whose actual form extends only up to the union of the Armenians (22 November 1439) — with a description of other acts of the council, or — and this seems to us more likely — one must think of a work distinct from the dialogue. For already in the dialogue he speaks not only of his court diary, but also of another of his books on the acts of the council, distinct from the narrative presented in the dialogue; for in Collation **XII** of 4 December 1438 he says: *All that was done through the council we have recorded elsewhere,* and in the narrative of Collation **XXII** concerning the acts of

27 June 1439 he states: *I have noted separately, in another treatise, what was done in the council.*

Since this is the case, lest confusion arise between the dialogue work and the other work on the acts, and also to provide at the same time the briefest possible title for the treatise being edited by us, I have chosen the title: **ACTA LATINA CONCILII FLORENTINI** (Latin Acts of the Council of Florence). This title certainly fully satisfies the intention of the author Andreas de Santacroce; for the preliminary opuscle on the legitimate translation of the Council of Basel to Ferrara, together with the matters narrated concerning the acts at the Council of Ferrara and Florence, constitute a single work composed of three parts: **I.** A prooemium in the form of a brief apologetic treatise, in which there is at the same time a good demonstration of the quality of the author as a historian, not merely narrating facts but also investigating their causes, occasions, and effects. **II.** The Conferences or Disputations of Ferrara. **III.** The Conferences of Florence.

ON THE MANUSCRIPTS

The following manuscripts I have consulted for this edition.

1. Manuscript V = Vaticanus latinus 4119.

This is a paper manuscript, 29 x 16 cm.; the last four folios are of parchment. The greater part, fols. 1r–157v, was written by a copyist scribe in calligraphic humanistic script; the last folios, namely the greater part of page 157v and the following pages, 158r–162v, were done by a second copyist scribe — the same one who wrote the Corsinian codex 779 (41-F-117) of the Roman library of the Accademia dei Lincei. A third hand, which frequently appears in the margins and in other corrections of the text itself — and indeed in cursive script — is without doubt the autograph hand of the author Andreas de Sancta Cruce himself, whose autograph hand is known to me from the Gaddian codex 48 of the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, which is partly autograph and partly calligraphic. For this reason the value of the Vatican codex 4119 is greatly enhanced, as it was inspected and corrected by the author himself. Nonetheless, not a few errors of the first copyist scribe escaped his vigilance — a scribe who at times seems to have worked on his task too hastily, or who often did not understand the text presented to him,

whether orally or in writing. Nevertheless, nearly all of his errors can be remedied, either from context or from other documents. Thus the very frequent citations from Sacred Scripture, the Fathers, Councils, and secular authors, if they appear lacunose or mutilated in the author, can easily be restored. The texts of papal bulls in Andreas de Sancta Cruce can be compared with the original or authentic bulls. Also the Greek historical work called the *Praktika* can be called into service.

Concerning the date of the manuscript, this is established: it was already in the library of Nicholas V (1447–1453). Indeed, from the dedication of the work to Albert II, King of the Romans (died 27 October 1439), from the narrative of the death of Ludovico Pontano, protonotary (died shortly before November 1439), and from the documents concerning the union of the Armenians concluded on 22 November, it seems with great probability that the codex was completed at the end of 1439 or shortly thereafter.

Since I use codex V as the basis of the edition, I must add some remarks on the abbreviations of this codex and other characteristic palaeographic features. I do not dwell on the customary legal and canonical sigla here, which are very frequently found in the first part of the work. More worthy of attention are the following:

- a) Double consonants are frequently written where single ones would be expected, for example: *lettentur*, *summitur*, *summendo*, *commedunt*, *motta*, *neccesse*;
- b) Conversely, double consonants are written as single ones, for example: *corupti*, *apetunt*, *silogismus*, *humilime*;
- c) *c* and *t* are frequently confused, even beyond the cases otherwise customary in the combinations *ci* and *ti*, for example: *detertavimus*, *extogitari*, *catetizandis*, *ottavo*;
- d) Confusion in the expression of *h* and in its omission, for example: *ortatur*, *habundantia*, *perhennis*, *cohetaneos*, *inchohabimus*, *cohoperator*;
- e) The greatest confusion is found in proper names, whether Latin or Greek, for example: *Collocensis*, *Agato*, and the subscriptions to the decree of union of the Greeks;

- f) *c, g, ch, q* are confused, for example: *vagare, Valagie, secuntur*;
- g) *s, ss, z, x, sc* are confused, for example: *sexio, mixticum, Ambroxii, testus, cancellaria, scilentium*;
- h) The omission of abbreviation marks is the source of several errors, for example: *invicem, onderet, ondere, dapnabiliter, traslaturum*;
- i) On the other hand, false abbreviation marks are placed, for example: *Spiritus. s.* (this sign = *scilicet*; but it should express *sanctus*);
- j) Before *t*, a *p* is added, for example: *legiptime, scrupitari*;
- l) *i, j, ii, y, u* are confused, for example: *tirampnus, Ylarii* (in place of *Hilarii*), *caput* (in place of *capit*);
- m) The customary abbreviation marks for distinguishing the particles *prae, per, pro* are confused on several occasions, so that the reading becomes doubtful, for example: *perducemus* in place of *producemus*, *praepositio* in place of *propositio*. Similar confusions occur in the abbreviations of *q* with a line (*quod, quia, qui*);
- n) The scribe sometimes correctly notes, when there is a large empty space: *hic nihil deficit* (fols. 91v, 114v, 149v), but in the text itself, when it concerns for example some citation to be expressed or a name to be written out, he sometimes leaves an empty space, but then appears to have forgotten to remedy this deficiency.

-
2. Manuscript C = Corsinianus 779 (41-F-17) of the library of the Accademia dei Lincei, formerly of the library of S. Maria sopra Minerva (as appears from a note placed before the text), a paper manuscript of the 15th century, 28 x 20 cm., written by the same hand that produced the last five folios of codex V, as Ubaldus Mannucci already recognized. Indeed the entire codex, as the same author explained in the journal *Bessarione*, 30 (1914) 154, depends immediately on codex V. For several lacunae, dittographies, and other errors are the same in both manuscripts. Let us offer a few characteristic examples.

From the first part (Dedication and apologetic treatise):

a) *protonotharii* VC; *in Petro* VC in place of *in Petrum*; on the other hand *in Petrum* VC in place of *in Petro*; *silicet* VC; *domini* VC in place of *omnium*; *Faustus* VC in place of *fastus*; *efficiunt* VC in place of *efficiuntur*; *nihilominus* in place of *nihil nimis*;

b) An entire line expressed in V (chap. 1: *susceperunt – hoc otio*) is omitted by C due to an eye-skip; the sentence placed in V in two lines between the words *quin ymo sibi similem – quin ymo et infidelium* (chap. 2) is omitted by codex C; the sentence placed in V (chap. 7) between the words *velut – rami* is omitted in C, because after *ramo* the word *velut* recurs; *Petrus – subscripsi* (chap. 12) placed in V is omitted in C, because the sentence immediately before ended with the same word *subscripsi*; the words *errorem expressum* (chap. 12), although expunged in V, are repeated by C; the word *successor* in codex V (chap. 14) was changed by codex C to *successorum*; *ratiove* V (chap. 3), *ratione* C; *casu* (abbreviated *cau*) V (chap. 20), *cautius* C.

From the third part, the sermon on Purgatory (in V: fols. 132v–135v; in C: fols. 127v–130r):

a) *vestre postulationem* VC in place of *vestre postulationi*; *tune mestigmata* VC in place of *in me stigmata*; *Gregorius Nycenus* V, *Gregorius Nicenus* C; *siceram* in place of *sanctam* VC; *artem* VC in place of *Aerium*;

b) *sed Dei* V, *sed fidei* C; *orationibus vero* V, *orationibus veris* C; *misericordias* V, *misericordia* C, in place of *misericordius*; *miserere* V, *miserie* C; *pro peccatoribus oramus*, *pro peccatoribus quidem divinam misericordiam imploramus* V, *pro peccatoribus oramus quidem divinam misericordiam imploramus* C; *conscii* (abbreviated) V, *yaii* C.

The variant readings from the sermon on Purgatory comparing the three manuscripts are as follows:

Cr: *offerri commemorant / orationibus in vigilia / Theodoricus episcopus / dona Sabbaoth / que est iuxta mensuram / de vita infernali*

V: *offerri commemoretur / orationibus que in vigilia / Theodoricus episcopus / dona Sabaothi / que iuxta mensuram / de morte infernali*

C: *offerri commemorent / orationibus in vigilia / Theodericus episcopus / dona Sabaoth / que est iuxta mensuram / de vita infernali*

Manuscript Cr = Cracoviensis 104 of the Metropolitan Archive, a paper manuscript of the 15th century, 28 x 20 cm., fols. 1r–166v. In this miscellaneous codex, described by Ignacy Polkowski in the book *Archiwum do dziejów literatury i oświaty w Polsce III*, Kraków 1884, p. 83, the first part of the work of Andreas de S. Cruce is omitted, namely the dedication and the apologetic treatise. There are found therein other treatises, namely *Flores sententiarum b. Thomae Aquino collecti per magistrum Iohannem de Turrecremata* (Torquemada) *in concilio Basiliensi anno 1437*, the decrees of the Council of Constance, the oration of Giuliano (Cesarini) at the Council of Basel, and the letter of union of the Latins and Armenians. Before the text of Andreas de S. Cruce there is the title: *Liber dialogi disputationis occidentalium et orientalium per d(ominum) Andream de Sancta Cruce advocatum compositus. Disputationes Latinorum cum Grecis*. The codex gives the text of Andreas de Sancta Cruce only in those parts which deal with the union of the Greeks in the council, up to the decree of union, omitting the rest that is found in codices V and C, with the exception of the words that immediately follow the decree of union of the Greeks in C: *Andreas. Capiēs* (in Cr: *Copie scilicet*) *frater optime, ... Et tu vale.*

Codex Cr presents more corrupted texts than in V (and C); indeed at the beginning it alters the words, as is apparent from the following comparison:

V (fol. 15v): *Cum res memoratu dignas, que nostro tempore evenere, dum forensibus ex negotiis quid superextaret otii, scripto mandarem, ephymereum curialem in librum conficiens et Gre- [the above-mentioned line] curialium dierum novum ascribens, cum Grecorum conventus eorumque adventus causas inter communia scriberem, conspexi non convenire mixturam re, modo et personis a communibus differentem.*

Cr (fol. 1r): *Res memoratu dignas ac nostro occursu(!) temporibus compendioso tractatu etsi mandaverim registris(?; the scribe writes: ris cum) corum conventus eorumque adventus causas inter communia meditarer adscribere, conspexi non convenire mixturam re, modo et personis a communibus differentem.*

Besides the omissions already mentioned, codex Cr omits on one occasion something also faithfully noted in the course of the conciliar narrative of Andreas de Sancta Cruce in codices V (and C). The example is this:

V (fol. 81r): *Decreti autem translationis verba per dominum Anthonium Portugalensem episcopum in generali sessione lecta hec fuerunt: Eugenius* (the entire text of the decree follows)

Cr (fol. 73v): *Decreti autem translationis verba per r(everendum) dominum Anthonium Portugaliensem episcopum in generali sessione lecta fuere etc.* (the entire text of the decree is omitted)

Whence the scribe of codex Cr drew his material is difficult to say. Certainly the noted omissions were not found by him in the codices of Andreas de Sancta Cruce, but by his own choice — in order to record only the strictly conciliar matters concerning the union of the Greeks — he omitted the first part, namely the dedication and the apologetic treatise, and the matters pertaining to the union of the Armenians. Why he omitted the bull of the translation of the council to Florence, I do not know. The brief notice about the departure of the Greek Emperor on 26 August 1439 he perhaps neglected through inattention. Nonetheless codex Cr depends on codices V and C, even though in his own way he omitted some things, as I said above, and also, at least as regards individual words, changed some things. Thus codex Cr wrote more than once *Rupecremata* (cf. fol. 156v) (= Torquemada), because V and C also have this; for on one occasion he himself corrected the name in the margin to *Thurecremata* (fol. 141v), and was therefore aware of the error in the codices. Also in the decree of union of the Greeks, in that part where the subscriptions of the Greeks are recorded, it has the same phrase as found in codex V and C: *Hic debent esse episcopi Russie* (Here should be the bishops of Russia) — and indeed at the same place as in V and C.

The dependence of codex Cr on codex C seems to be greater than on codex V; already the fact of the easier reading found in codex C over codex V must have impelled the scribe of codex Cr to follow codex C or something similar. At least some examples demonstrate with probability that the dependence of codex Cr is more on codex C. Thus in the sermon on Purgatory the variant readings found are as I showed in the book *Concilium Florentinum, I, Erstes Gutachten der Lateiner über das Fegfeuer*, in *Orientalia Christiana*, XVI, 3 (1929) 285–298.

I regret that the Milanese manuscript of the 16th century — according to the description made by Giulio Porro in the book *Catalogo dei codici manoscritti della Trivulziana* (Turin 1884, p. 399) — was not known to me until after the last war, in which that codex was destroyed. But I doubt whether the use of this manuscript, which was written only in the 16th century, could have provided me with great assistance in producing a better edition. Nonetheless I express my thanks to the distinguished scholar Campana, who informed me of this codex on 24 November 1951. It is useful to record from the description of the codex the title according to Porro: *Sancta Cruce (Andrea de), Ad Ser(enissimum) Caesarem semper augustum Albertum Romanorum regem dialogus Andreae de S. Cruce de Roma apostolici concistorii advocati in Ludovicum Pontanum Romanum, de Ecclesiae primatu et gestis per Latinos Graecosque patres in Ferrariensi demum translata oecumenica synodo in Spiritu s(ancto) legitime congregata*.

The other manuscripts known to me — namely Vaticanus latinus 6387, a paper manuscript of the 17th century, 25.7 x 19.5 cm., and Borgiani latini 33–35 of the Vatican Library, an autograph of Horatius Iustinianus (Giustiniani) written before 1638 — can be disregarded; for the former is merely a copy of the above-mentioned codex V, probably written by Leo Allatius, and the Borgian codices are nothing other than the basis of the edition made by Horatius Giustiniani, *Acta sacri oecumenici concilii Florentini*, Rome 1638. In this book the second and third parts of the work of Andreas de Sancta Cruce constitute the principal part of the writer (later cardinal) Giustiniani, who collected various documents on the Council of Florence in his edition. Of the manuscripts of Andreas de Sancta Cruce, only codex V was known to him.

His edition certainly rendered the best service to scholarship for its time, but no longer suffices for modern requirements. For besides the fact that he does not

clearly distinguish between the various documents of his collection on the documents of the Council of Florence, he also aroused the anger of his fellow citizen Leo Allatius on account of the public edition of documents which — as Allatius at least asserts — had been shown to him by the latter only for purposes of reading; furthermore he tells us nothing about the author Andreas de Sancta Cruce, gives us no account of the general arrangement of this advocate's work, nor anything about the parts omitted by Horatius Giustiniani. In reproducing the text he frequently committed errors, as will be apparent from a comparison of that edition with the present one; he often did not verify citations, and those he did verify he does not always indicate exactly as regards the editions used. Nevertheless his numerous notes — especially those concerning doctrinal matters — retain their value even today.

Ubaldo Mannucci has the merit of having published the first part of the work of Andreas de Sancta Cruce in the already-named journal *Bessarione*, 30 (1914); nonetheless in his edition he was not successful in not a few passages, nor did he always exercise the necessary care regarding very many citations. I gratefully acknowledge that I owe no small debt to these two editors, but at the same time I leave it to the judgment of readers to assess what and how the new edition contributes to the advancement of scholarship beyond the two earlier ones.

In my edition I have often been obliged to make emendations, but these I have always indicated as such by the customary signs < > or [], whereas Horatius Iustinianus almost never distinguished his frequent alterations of the manuscript text from the rest of the text in any way. My emendations are for the most part completely certain when it is a matter of certain consonants or vowels of words, in orthographic errors, and in the confusion of proper names. They are also often certain at least as regards sense, when it is a matter of citations from Sacred Scripture, the Fathers, and the Councils. For in these cases the emendation can be established from the edition of Sacred Scripture and the Fathers, or from papal bulls and the acts of other councils already critically edited. Also from the comparison of the manuscript text with the Greek text of the acts now critically edited by Gill, a remedy could be applied with profit to heal the errors. Nonetheless I had to proceed with moderation. For Andreas de Santacroce, whose other works I also know, did not use classical Latin; his work on the Council of Florence

manifests the character of a diary, for the composition of which he made use of his own notes made during the public sessions and also written documents (those of the notaries of the council). It is therefore not surprising that it presents a somewhat imperfect form. Moreover, even the orators of the council in the disputations did not always recite prepared speeches; neither the common interpreter Nicolaus Sagundinus nor Andreas de Santacroce was a theologian. Therefore let those who read this edition of Andreas de Sancta Cruce not be surprised at the often imperfect style of the author; but, bearing in mind the circumstances of the disputations he recorded — with the interruptions that occurred on the part of the Byzantine emperor, Cardinal Cesarini, and those reciting texts of the Fathers and Councils — let them rather judge with kindness.

III. ON THE AUTHOR ANDREAS DE SANCTA CRUCE

Andreas de Sancta Cruce — in Italian, Santacroce — was born in Rome in the year 1402 from an illustrious family. Between the years 1423 and 1427 he devoted himself to the study of law at the universities of Padua and Bologna. At Bologna, on 22 May 1428, he was distinguished with the laurels of the doctorate. He did not consent to the civic revolt of the city of Bologna against pontifical rule; indeed, on 15 December he fled to Ferrara, and following the counsel of his patron Blessed Nicolaus Albergati, cardinal and bishop of Bologna, he returned to Rome. There he was appointed by Pope Eugene IV in the year 1433 as advocate of the sacred consistory. He remained faithful to the Supreme Pontiff when the latter, in the year 1434, was compelled by turbulent men to flee from the City. He was a man of the most upright character, held in great esteem by the Supreme Pontiffs. He died in Rome around the year 1473. He is the author of several opuscles and books. He wrote the following:

1. *Dialogus de Ecclesiae primatu et gestis in Concilio Florentino* (= Latin Acts of the Council of Florence).
2. *Gesta concilii* (Acts of the Council). Whether this work — not yet found — is a work distinct from the book cited under number 1 is not entirely certain. For it could be a continuation of the first book, which closes the series of conciliar acts with the decree of the union of the Armenians (22 November 1439), while the author, in his book *Ephemeridum liber curialis*, speaking of

the bull of 3 January 1443, asserts: *the sequence of this matter I wrote in the conciliar acts* (fol. 52r).

3. *Ephemeridum liber curialis* (Court Book of Daily Records), not yet edited — except for some extracts — preserved in the partly autograph Gaddian codex 48 of the 15th century in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana. This codex has been treated by G. Beckmann in *Deutsche Reichstagsakten*, **XIII**, Gotha 1908, p. 334 note 5; p. 345 note 2; p. 577 note 3; by Mehus, who cited this codex under the title of the Magliabechian codex **XXIV**, 109, in the work *Ambrosii Traversari latinae epistolae*, **I**, Florence, pp. 381–3, 427–9; and above all by Picotti in the journal already cited above.
4. *Liber decisionum causarum pro auditoribus Rotae Romanae* (Book of Decisions of Cases for the Auditors of the Roman Rota), cited in the codex *Ephemeridum liber curialis* (fol. 20r).
5. *Tractatus de quaestionibus praecedentiae* (Treatise on Questions of Precedence), cited in the same place, fol. 114r.
6. *De notis publica auctoritate approbatis* (On Marks Approved by Public Authority).
7. *Votum* (legal opinion) *de quaestione institutionis ordinis Iesuatarum* (Gesuati), preserved in the library of San Marco in Venice, Latin class **IV**, 104 (2632). There we read (fol. 55r): *And thus I declare my counsel and advise, I Andreas de Sancta Cruce, doctor of both laws, advocate of the sacred apostolic consistory, and in witness thereof I have subscribed with my own hand and secured with my customary seal.*
8. *Sententia Andreae de Sancta Cruce contra episcopum Civitatis Castellanensis pro abbate S. Pauli, super exemptione ecclesiarum monasterii* (Judgment of Andreas de Sancta Cruce against the bishop of Città Castellana on behalf of the abbot of St. Paul, concerning the exemption of the churches of the monastery), 13 November 1444; cf. B. Trifone, *Le carte del monastero di San Paolo*, in *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria*, **XXXII** (1909) 63–64.
9. *Responsio oratoribus regis Franciae pro defensione Ferdinandi regis et regni Siciliae, in concilio Mantuano* (Response to the Orators of the King of France in Defense of King Ferdinand and the Kingdom of Sicily, at the Council of Mantua). Of this treatise I know two manuscripts of the 15th

century, namely M. 35 of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana and n. 792 of the library formerly named after Vittorio Emanuele.

This second codex is parchment, of 28 folios, written in humanistic script, and bears the following title (fol. 1v): *Andreas de Sanctacroce, most learned in law and consistorial advocate, sends abundant greetings to King Ferdinand*. It pleases me to add here from the second codex the following passages, which shed light on the life of Andreas de Sancta Cruce:

(fol. 2r) Pliny writes that Isocrates sold one of his orations for twenty talents, and Demosthenes for fifty. I, at the command of Your Majesty, came to Mantua for the universal assembly of all Christian kings and princes convoked by the Supreme Pontiff Pius **II**, where I delivered the oration written below in defense of your kingdoms. I know that, by reason of its subject matter, the persons involved, and the place, no oration delivered by anyone has been worthy of a greater reward — except that the inequality of rhetorical adornment on the part of the speaker might be a shortcoming. May Your Majesty also receive, in which I have written all the titles of your principate and the merit of your person for the royal throne — after the events of our times concerning the commonwealth, faithfully written by me — the task I shall take care to send, if this is compensated at its proper price. In these writings, the deeds of your father in Italy and your successes in attaining your kingdom are set out as a guide for your counsels in conducting affairs, since for the most part present and future matters are more prudently ordered from knowledge of the past. Farewell.

(fol. 3r) Oration of Andreas de Sancta Cruce, most learned in law and consistorial advocate of King Ferdinand, delivered against the French orators at the Council of Mantua.

About to respond, most holy Father, to those things which were said here yesterday against the rights of the most serene prince Ferdinand, King of Sicily, most devoted son of Your Holiness, by the illustrious orators of the most Christian prince the King of the Franks and of other princes of Gaul, I shall set forth most briefly the rights of the same in the Kingdom of Sicily, through which it will be most manifestly apparent that all the other rights set forth in this place are without effect — and I shall do so in words full of charity, tending toward peace and the laying

down of arms, and directed toward the end of this assembly and the desire of Your Holiness. I shall first premise this one point: that the things said here yesterday by the said orators were fitting neither to the place of this holy assembly, nor to the time, nor to their lords on whose behalf they spoke. Your Holiness has come, at the greatest inconvenience to your own person and to the ecclesiastical state, inflamed with zeal for protecting the Christian religion, to this city of Mantua, so as to gather the most devoted princes of the Christian faith to restore the exiled King of Hungary and his sons.

(fol. 28r) King Ferdinand therefore requests of Your Holiness, of this sacred order, and of all the princes and orators of princes present, that the holy laws not be violated, that arms against him be laid down, that his rights to the kingdom be protected and defended by Your Holiness, to whom he is immediately subject, and that it not be permitted that any war be waged against him. Otherwise he protests that he will defend himself and his kingdom by arms, as divine law of nations and human law permit, and that it does not rest with him if war is not waged against the infidels. And let those who are doing these things consider what laws and what divine precepts they are striving to contravene. Let Your Holiness rise up for God, and let the most illustrious princes and orators of kings and princes call upon the Most Christian King and the princes of Gaul to lay down their arms, to conform themselves to the laws, the places, and the times, and to flee from divine punishments.

From the letters of Nicolaus Sagundinus, formerly interpreter at the Council of Florence, it is useful to publish here for the first time a letter which he sent to Andreas de Sancta Cruce on 6 June 1446 from the city of Naples, as it is preserved in the library of San Marco in Venice in codex 4418 (Ms. lat. cl. 13, n. 62) of the 15th century, fols. 47r–47v, as a copy. This document is the most beautiful testimony to the friendship between these two persons.

To Lord Andreas de Sancta Cruce.

Most excellent and most humane man. If I were ignorant of your humanity, if I did not possess, confirmed by long experience, knowledge of your outstanding virtue and integrity in all things, I would certainly doubt whether that love of yours toward me and the expression of a certain ardent goodwill still lived and subsisted

in its strength, for as long as I have been far from your eyes and the distance of places has intervened separated by distance, I had been prevented from conversing with you in a friendly and familiar manner. For ordinary friendships — those contracted lightly and not proceeding from firmness of soul under the guidance of virtue — tend to last but a little while, and once mutual acquaintance has been interrupted even briefly, they are straightway broken off and obliterated most easily, like a fading color. But since I know you, and since I have a clear perception of the sincerity of your love toward me, I can have no doubt whatsoever that you love me even in my absence and continue to pursue me with your customary goodwill. For you took it upon yourself of your own accord to love me, moved not by any merits of mine but by the impulse of the charity innate in you, and you do not cease to show me favor — freely and steadfastly — both when I am present and no less when I am absent.

For this reason I easily persuaded myself to commend to you, with as much diligence as I could muster, the bearer of this letter, my fellow citizen the priest Marcus, who is setting out for Rome and is in the greatest need of your patronage. You have not disdained in the past to take up his cause in all things with great humanity and, having taken it up, to defend it. This benefit of yours toward him, the man — not ungrateful, with a grateful heart — proclaims everywhere with the greatest enthusiasm, celebrates your name with the highest honor, pursues your praises with reverence, and raises them to the heavens. What he presently desires for himself, and what he wishes to obtain, you will be able to understand more fully from him personally when he explains it to you face to face.

What I now ask of you — and what I shall strive to obtain by a certain right of mine, founded on our mutual goodwill — is this: that you, following your own humanity and your own character, bring yourself to show your kindness toward this poor man. I beseech you by our friendship; be present with your counsel and assistance, your authority, your favor, your resources, and finally your patronage, and undertake to protect and defend his cause. Come to the aid of a man who is poor and needy, but otherwise good and simple in his struggles, and bring it about at last that the opinion he holds of you in his mind does not deceive him. This will certainly be an act of service acceptable to God the most good Father; it will be wonderfully fitting and consistent with your name and your character; and

moreover it will be most gratifying to me, who am most devoted to you and love you most dearly.

I do not wish to say more on this matter, lest you seem to attribute more to my words than to your own outstanding humanity. I hope finally that, having obtained kind leave from the illustrious Senate of Venice, I shall depart from here shortly and come there, to return to Venice thereafter. There, therefore, as befits our old friendship, I shall revisit you with joy and embrace you from the heart. Farewell. From Naples, the VIth of June, M CCCC L VI (1446).

IV. THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE DIALOGUE WORK OF ANDREAS DE SANCTA CRUCE ON THE PRIMACY AND THE ACTS OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE, OR THE LATIN ACTS OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

Andreas de Sancta Cruce had the intention — as is apparent from the dedication to Albert, King of the Romans (died October 1439) and from the prooemium of the acts concerning the Council of Florence — of demonstrating the legitimacy of the translation of the Council of Basel to Ferrara and then to Florence, and of describing the disputations of the Latins with the Greeks. For this reason he prefixes an apologetic treatise to the historical narrative, or Latin acts, of the Council of Florence. In this treatise, in the form of a dialogue, he refutes the arguments of his friend Ludovico Pontano (1409–1439), protonotary and doctor of law, born in Rome, who — sent as legate of King Alfonso of Aragon together with Nicolaus Panormitanus to the Council of Basel — remained there until his premature death at the age of 30 years, as a follower of the disastrous theory of conciliarism, that is, of the superiority of the ecumenical council over the pope, and therefore as the most fierce opponent of the papal translation of the Council of Basel to Ferrara and Florence.

This is demonstrated by his writings still preserved in the Viennese library (now Vindobon. lat. 4943, fols. 95v–97r; 98v–101v; cf. also the manuscripts of the library of San Marco in Venice, class. VIII, canon law, cod. 2), namely *De potestate ecclesiae universalis super papam* (On the Power of the Universal Church over the Pope), and his *Quaestio per eundem facta ad depositionem papae incorrigibilis procedi posse* (Question composed by him on whether one may

proceed to the deposition of an incorrigible pope); and in the Vatican Library, namely Vaticanus latinus 4905, fols. 1r–16r: *Tractatus super potestatem universalis ecclesiae et generalium conciliorum illam repraesentantium, pronuntiatus in concilio Basiliensi* (Treatise on the Power of the Universal Church and of the General Councils Representing It, delivered at the Council of Basel); fols. 16v–23r: *Sermo in praesentia universitatis Coloniensis et venerabilis capituli et cleri, in quo ostendit, quomodo non peccat synodus (Basiliensis) in refutando pacem, quam sibi offert Eugenius papa* (Sermon in the presence of the University of Cologne and the venerable chapter and clergy, in which he shows how the synod of Basel does not sin in rejecting the peace offered to it by Pope Eugene); fol. 23v: *Parvus alius tractatus super eo, quod papa concilium generale dissolvere non potest* (A short further treatise on the question that the pope cannot dissolve a general council).

From these testimonies it follows with certainty that Ludovico Pontano held erroneous notions concerning the Primacy. Choosing the form of a dialogue, Andreas de Sancta Cruce — well acquainted with the errors of his friend — refutes them at length in his apologetic prooemium and brings forward many proofs from Sacred Scripture, from the Fathers, from the councils, from canon law, and from civil law, in order to defend the primacy of the pope and to demonstrate the legitimacy of the Council of Florence. Andreas de Sancta Cruce retains the form of dialogue with his friend Ludovico Pontano — who toward the end of his life became more at peace with the Holy See — also in the second and third parts of his work, where the disputations of the Latins with the Greeks are described; but he rarely addresses Pontano there, because the disputations themselves between Latins and Greeks already constitute a vivid narrative; for this was one of the reasons explicitly stated by the author in the dedication for why he chose the dialogue form in his book.

Since we are already at those matters which directly concern the history of the Council of Florence, I think it is not without use to set out here in summary form how Andreas de Sancta Cruce divided his narratives and how he distinguished the chronology and circumstances of the character of the individual sessions. We reserve for the following chapter the treatment of the fundamental question of what and how the author contributed to the objective history of the Council of Florence,

and we shall carry this out through a comparative study — that is, by comparing the accounts of Andreas de Sancta Cruce with the other authentic sources of the Council of Florence and with the two Greek histories of the Council of Florence, namely the *Praktika* and the *Memoirs* of Silvester Syropoulos.

Andreas de Sancta Cruce explicitly declares that he wishes to present objective truth; thus at the end of the work, after narrating the union of the Greeks, he says: *and upon this the longed-for conclusion of this most holy union was imposed. You will receive, dearest brother, what I have recounted — even if it could have been recounted more eloquently, yet not more correctly or more properly — just as it happened, and in the very words of those who spoke, lest I be judged to have strayed from the truth of the events by the adornment of words.* Already in the dedication he had affirmed: *I set everything down in writing, departing in nothing from the truth of the matter, deliberately omitting rhetorical ornament, recording the words as they were spoken, lest I should in any way stray from the truth of what was done.*

This author is an eyewitness of the Council of Florence, already by reason of his office and by his nature a most acute observer, as is clear from his other book, namely the *Ephemeridum liber curialis*. He restricts himself to describing the sessions at which he himself was present; for this reason he omits the private sessions of the Latin and Greek deputies on the Last Things, and the sessions of the Greeks among themselves, of which much is found in the *Praktika*.

The author himself indicates these general divisions of his work:

1. The general title at the beginning (fol. 1r): *To the most serene Caesar, ever Augustus, Albert, King of the Romans. Dialogue of Andreas de Sancta Cruce of Rome, advocate of the apostolic consistory, against Ludovico Pontano the Roman, on the primacy of the Church and the acts of the Latin and Greek fathers at the ecumenical synod of Ferrara, finally transferred to Florence, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit.*
2. After the dedication, before the apologetic treatise (dialogue), there appears (fol. 1v): *Dialogue of Lord Andreas de Sancta Cruce of Rome, consistorial advocate, and Lord Ludovico, protonotary.*

3. After the apologetic treatise, before the description of the arrival of the Greeks at Ferrara, there is no title — neither before the common session of 9 April 1438, nor before the common session of 9 October (8 October in the book *Praktika*), where moreover only the salutatory speeches of Bessarion and Andreas Chrysoberges, Latin Archbishop of Rhodes (in the book *Praktika* placed in a separate session on 11 October), were delivered; nonetheless a title expressing the name of the orator is prefixed to the two speeches. But for the same session Andreas also gives the salutatory text of Mark Eugenicus (while in the various parts of the *Praktika* — that is, in the acts of the Greek notaries and in the narrative account — this speech is recorded for 8 October or 13 October); but before this speech he places the words (fol. 23v): *Here begins the second book, in which the Greeks begin the conferences with the Latins, and the option having been given, the conference of the Ephesian.*
4. At the beginning of the following session, under the date of 13 October, Andreas de Sancta Cruce says (fol. 24v): *Conference of the second day, the thirteenth of the same month. The Cardinal, the Archbishop of Cologne, the Provincial, the Ephesian, the Nicaean.*
5. At the beginning of the session of 16 October, there appears a title (fol. 25v): *The third conference was held on the sixteenth of October.*
6. There follows (fol. 27r): *The fourth meeting was on the twentieth of October.*
7. Concerning the fourth and fifth conferences omitted by him, he has this to say (fol. 27r): *The two conferences of the Lord Archbishop of Cologne I did not trouble to record, because they were not formally collected; but since in the seventh conference he repeated all the same things, they were therefore not recorded here — but look there for what he said, where he declared what he had expressed here in a confused manner.*
8. (fol. 28r) *The sixth conference on the first of November.*
9. (fol. 30r) *The seventh conference, the fourth of November.*
10. (fol. 33v) *The eighth conference, the eighth of November.*
11. (fol. 40r) *The eleventh of November was the ninth act.*
12. (fol. 45v) *The eighteenth of November, the tenth act.*
13. (fol. 51v) *The tenth (!) (XI) act: conference of the second, third, and fourth days.*
14. (fol. 65r) *The eleventh act (XII), the eighth of December.*

15. (fol. 73v) *The XIIIth act (XIII), the thirteenth of December.*
16. (fol. 81v) *The third book: on the procession of the Holy Spirit, discussed at Florence. Andreas, Ludovico, the Provincial, the Ephesian, the Cardinal, the Emperor, the Archbishop of Cologne.*
17. (fol. 82r) *The thirteenth (XIV) public conference held on the second of March.*
18. (fol. 87r) *The second disputation at Florence. On the fifth of March, in the order and manner as has often been said and also recorded, the Provincial began in the following manner.*
19. (fol. 92r) *On the eighth of March, in the third meeting at Florence, the Ephesian gave the beginning to a contest of this kind.*
20. (fol. 98r) *On the tenth of March, in the meeting as above, the Cardinal began in this manner.*
21. (fol. 103r) *Andreas. On the fourteenth of March, in the meeting of the city of Florence, at the customary order and hour at which the assembly of disputations is accustomed to take place, the Greeks gave the opening word to the Ephesian.*
22. (fol. 108r) *On the seventeenth of March the disputation was begun.*
23. (fol. 115r) *On the twenty-first of March the disputation was begun, in which a response was to be made to the statements of the Greeks.*
24. (fol. 123r) *On the twenty-fourth of March another public meeting was held.*
25. *After the public sessions of March 1439 were concluded, other paths were begun for preparing the union of the Greeks. Andreas de Sancta Cruce distinguishes his narratives in various ways, for example (fol. 130v) *The Pope*; by use of the word ANDREAS when beginning to narrate a new matter: (fol. 132v) *The content of the documents (on Purgatory) was as follows*; (fol. 135v) on the preliminary formulas of the decree; (fol. 136r) on the speeches of Johannes de Montenegro and Johannes de Torquemada; (fol. 142r) *On the twentieth of June a meeting was held in the customary manner of the preceding ones, where, all being assembled except the Emperor, the Lord Cardinal began*; (fols. 149r, 149v, 151v) on the immediate preparation of the decree of union of the Greeks; (fol. 153r) on the promulgation of the union; (fol. 153v) with the title: *Decree* (the entire text of the decree of union of the Greeks in Latin follows).*

26. Appendix. I said above that Andreas de Sancta Cruce had the intention of demonstrating that the Council of Florence was legitimate and of describing the entire course of the business of the union of the Greeks at this council. Even if the death of his friend Ludovico Pontano had not occurred, he would have interrupted, in accordance with his original intention, the work written in the form of a dialogue between Andreas and Ludovico. Nonetheless there follows still an appendix, in which, after the death of Pontano is narrated most briefly, the union of the Armenians is also described most briefly — but with a longer presentation of the text of three documents: namely the letter of credence of the Patriarch of the Armenians on behalf of his legates, the letter of a personal declaration by the consul Paolo Imperiali, a supporter of the Armenian union, to Pope Eugene IV, and finally the decree of union of the Armenians itself (22 November 1439).

V. WHAT AND HOW THE WORK OF ANDREAS DE SANCTA CRUCE CONTRIBUTES TO THE HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

I wish to respond from the outset to two difficulties that can be raised against the historical value of the work of the Dialogue on the Primacy and on the acts of the Council of Florence. Did not Andreas sufficiently reveal in his apologetic prooemium that he was not an objective historian? Does not the form of dialogue chosen for his exposition throughout the entire work depart from truly historical method?

To resolve first the second objection, which is the easier one, I wish to point out that the dialogue form between Andreas de Sancta Cruce and Ludovico Pontano is most manifestly present in the apologetic treatise, but in the other two parts it appears rarely — and indeed in the manner of questions that contribute to a clearer and more concrete description of the historical events of the Council. Let us take some examples of the questions that Pontanus puts to his friend Andreas in the second and third parts of the work:

(fol. 17r) LUDOVICO: But did the Supreme Pontiff and those who were at Ferrara as the council not send some persons (to receive the Greeks arriving at Venice)?

(fol. 17v) LUDOVICO: How was (the Greek patriarch) received by the Supreme Pontiff?

(fol. 18r) LUDOVICO: What was the splendor of all the aforementioned (Latins)?

(fol. 18r) LUDOVICO: What place had been assigned to the Greek Emperor (in the church)?

(fol. 20v) LUDOVICO: Of our people, who (were the orators appointed for the public sessions)?

(fol. 18r) LUDOVICO: And of the Greeks?

(fol. 152r) LUDOVICO: Why was it not arranged so that so great an interval of time should not have elapsed, since these matters were concluded on the fourth of July!

The dialogue form chosen also gave the writer the opportunity to describe, by means of the questions put to him by Ludovico Pontano, sometimes even the smallest circumstances of the council sessions — something which also makes the burden of the reported disputations somewhat lighter for the modern reader.

The first difficulty is more serious, concerning the apologetic prooemium. But in order for our response to be better understood, we must first provide some brief summary of the ideas raised on the part of Ludovico Pontano against the Council of Florence and the pope, according to the account of Andreas de Sancta Cruce — which, from what has already been said above, agrees with the truth at least substantially. For Ludovico Pontanus was an open opponent of the translation of the Council of Basel to Ferrara and Florence, and he was a commissioner in the process of the Council of Basel against the pope, even though he was in favor of delaying this process. It is said of him in the acts of the Council of Basel: *Ludovico of Rome, protonotary, refuted and attacked those letters (of Eugene IV) on many grounds of both divine and human law* (on 27 March 1438).

Ludovico conceived of St. Peter and his successor, the Roman pontiff, as vicar of the Church, and in support of his theory he adduced texts from Sacred Scripture, for example Matt. 18:15–17, Gal. 2:11 (the rebuke of St. Peter by St. Paul), Acts

8:15, and above all from the Decree of Gratian with the citations of the Holy Fathers contained therein. Therefore he considered the translation of the Council of Basel to Ferrara and Florence — as having been done by the pope against the decree of the greater part of the synodal fathers of Basel — to be illegitimate, relying on the theory of conciliarism, which he saw as sanctioned in the decree of the Council of Constance.

On the other side, Andreas de Sancta Cruce adduced the customary texts for demonstrating the primacy of the Roman pontiff from Sacred Scripture, and cited many decisions of councils and Roman pontiffs and canons recorded in the Decree of Gratian. He pressed the following ideas, as Mannucci has well expounded: from the words of Christ it must be concluded that there exists a single vicar of Christ; the scriptures are to be interpreted according to the mind of the Fathers and the councils; and he brings forward testimonies of synods from the times of Pope Hilarus (461–468), Boniface I (418–422), Anastasius II (496–498), Symmachus (498–514), and from the letters of Leo I (440–461) and Gregory I (590–604); from the Doctors he cited Thomas Aquinas and indeed his contemporary Johannes de Torquemada. He descends to the individual difficulties raised by Ludovico Pontanus and refutes them. Above all, Andreas defends against Pontanus that Eugene IV translated the council to Ferrara and Florence for just causes; he also defends these decrees of the pope from their fruits, namely from the union of the Greeks already accomplished.

It cannot be denied that Andreas de Sancta Cruce proceeds also in the apologetic prooemium by scientific method, and that he understood well the prehistory of the Council of Florence and clearly perceived the root of the conflict between the resisting synodal fathers of Basel and the synodal fathers of the Council of Florence adhering to the pope.

In order to make it easier and more convenient for readers to know what and how Andreas de Sancta Cruce merited in the two principal parts of his work — immediately following the preliminary apologetic treatise — regarding the history of the Council of Florence, I wish first to set out, in the light of all the sources of the Council of Florence known to me, what is reported uniquely by Andreas de

Sancta Cruce concerning the Council of Florence and is of a kind not to be rejected as apocryphal; and secondly I wish to provide a summary of the individual sessions according to the mind of the author and to compare it with the Greek acts — that is, with the protocol of the Greek notaries as distinguished from the narrative account of the council.

From the work of the Dialogue on the acts of the Council of Florence alone we know: several texts given in full of four synodal speeches of the greatest value — those of Johannes de Montenegro, O.P., on the Primacy (two speeches) on 16 and 18 June 1439, and of Johannes de Torquemada, O.P., on the Holy Eucharist (two speeches) on the same days; the speech of Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini on the entire course of the business of the union, delivered on 27 June 1439; the mandate of the Greek patriarch on 9 April 1438; in the appendix, the narrative of the religious discussions of the Latins with the Armenians; and the letter of Paolo Imperiali, consul of Caffa (Theodosia in Crimea), to the pope on 1 December 1438. Found uniquely in Andreas de Sancta Cruce are several public discussions at Ferrara in the months of November and December 1438, and the two great speeches of Johannes de Montenegro on 21 and 24 March 1439 at Florence on the procession of the Holy Spirit.

Beyond these texts — of which not even a version is preserved elsewhere, at least according to the current state of research — we have the full Latin text of the formula of agreement between the Latins and the Greeks on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, concluded on 8 June 1439, only in the work of Andreas de Sancta Cruce; its Greek version is found in Syropoulos. We also have there other texts of preliminary formulas relating to the other four articles of the decree of union of the Greeks, of whose Greek version in the various phases of the mutual deliberations of the Latin and Greek deputies at least some redactions are found, primarily in the Greek narrative account (cf. Gill, pp. 146 ff.).

Two speeches — namely the speech of Giuliano Cesarini delivered on 4 June 1438 on Purgatory, and the speech of the Abbot General of the Cistercians delivered toward the end of November 1438 in the name of Duke Philip of Burgundy — are reported in full by Andreas de Sancta Cruce, and indeed, with the exception of a few sentences, are reproduced integrally; this I was able to establish by comparison with their text found elsewhere. The Most Reverend Petit also found a Greek

version of the speech of Cardinal Cesarini. The conciliar decrees of 9 April 1438 and 6 July 1439 as recorded by Andreas agree with the original bulls — something which well demonstrates the historical value of Andreas de Sancta Cruce. The inscription over the tomb of Joseph, the Greek patriarch, as recorded by him is, so far as I know, the unique contemporary literary testimony, and it agrees well with the ancient carved inscription still visible today — except for the last line, omitted by Andreas, and one or two differing words.

In Andreas de Sancta Cruce there are so many other historical circumstances of the sessions narrated that are absent from the Greek histories; and the speeches of the Latin synodal fathers are often reported at greater length than in their versions ordinarily found in the Greek Acts; and also concerning the speeches of the Greek synodal fathers in the common public sessions he gives a faithful account, even if not always equally long. In every case the speeches of the Latin synodal fathers and especially of the pope are recorded in their original text and — with the exception of some other Latin sources recording one or another Latin speech — are preserved uniquely in the dialogue of Andreas de Sancta Cruce on the acts of the Council of Florence (in the original language).

For the rest of what pertains to the question of the historical value of this author, the benevolent reader may consult my summary description of the entire conciliar narrative of Andreas de Sancta Cruce. In the notes which I shall add to the edition of the text, I shall indicate what in the Greek acts according to the edition of Gill, and in Syropoulos according to the edition of Creighton — or at least on some occasions according to the Parisian Greek codex 427 — corresponds to the conciliar narrative of Andreas de Sancta Cruce.

VI. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE ACCORDING TO THE MIND OF THE AUTHOR ANDREAS DE SANCTA CRUCE

I have given a sufficiently broad description of the sessions of the Council of Florence elsewhere. Here I wish only to set out in summary form in which characteristic points he presents the history of the Council of Florence.

It is useful to note from the outset that Andreas de Sancta Cruce applied the term *collatio* (conference) — and on a few occasions also *actus* (act) — exclusively to the public conciliar discussions of the Greeks and Latins assembled together; therefore neither the solemn session of 9 April 1438, nor the solemn session of 10 January 1439, nor finally the solemn session of 6 July 1439 is placed by him in the number of the Conferences. Likewise, the acts carried out at Ferrara in a conciliar manner before the arrival of the Greeks are not narrated by him. The concordance between the conferences of Andreas de Sancta Cruce and the protocol of the Greek notaries — insofar as the enumeration of the public discussions between Latins and Greeks is concerned — is as follows, with the sessions reported in Latin by Andreas de Sancta Cruce and in Greek by the author of the conciliar description (which is not the protocol of the Greek notaries) added at the beginning and end, and as regards the Florentine acts concluded through the Latin and Greek bull of union of the Greeks:

ACTS OF FERRARA — ANDREAS DE SANCTA CRUCE / GREEK PROTOCOL

Solemn Session, 9 Apr. 1438 / [Convocation of the ecumenical council, 9 Apr. 1438]

Collation **I**, 9 Oct. 1438 / Session **I** (Συνέλευσις / Assembly), 8 Oct. 1438

Collation **II**, 13 Oct. 1438 / Session **II**, 13 Oct. 1438

Collation **III**, 16 Oct. 1438 / Session **III**, 16 Oct. 1438

Collation **IV**, 20 Oct. 1438 / Session **IV**, 20 Oct. 1438

Collation **V**, 25 Oct. 1438 / Session **V**, 25 Oct. 1438

Collation **VI**, 1 Nov. 1438 / Session **VI**, 1 Nov. 1438

Collation **VII**, 4 Nov. 1438 / Session **VII**, 4 Nov. 1438

Collation **VIII**, 8 Nov. 1438 / Session **VIII**, 8 Nov. 1438

Collation **IX**, 11 Nov. 1438 / Session **IX**, 11 Nov. 1438

Collation **X**, 18 Nov. 1438 / Session **X**, 18 Nov. 1438

Session, 27 Nov. 1438 / [Session **XI**, 27 Nov. 1438]

Collation **XI**, 4 Dec. 1438 / [Session **XII**, 4 Dec. 1438]

Collation **XII**, 8 Dec. 1438 / [Session **XIII**, 8 Dec. 1438]

Collation **XIII**, 13 Dec. 1438 /

Solemn Session, 10 Jan. 1439 / [Last Session at Ferrara, 10 Jan. 1439]

FLORENTINE ACTS — ANDREAS DE SANCTA CRUCE / GREEK PROTOCOL

Particular Session, 26 Feb. 1439 / Session **I** (Συνέλευσις / Assembly), 26 Feb. 1439

Collation **I**, 2 Mar. 1439 / Session **II**, 2 Mar. 1439

Collation **II**, 5 Mar. 1439 / Session **III**, 5 Mar. 1439

Collation **III**, 7 (8) Mar. 1439 / Session **IV**, 7 Mar. 1439

Collation **IV**, 10 Mar. 1439 / Session **V**, 10 Mar. 1439

Collation **V**, 14 Mar. 1439 / Session **VI**, 14 Mar. 1439

Collation **VI**, 17 Mar. 1439 / Session **VII**, 17 Mar. 1439

Collation **VII**, 21 Mar. 1439 / [Session **VIII**, 21 Mar. 1439]

Collation **VIII**, 24 Mar. 1439 / [Session **IX**, 24 Mar. 1439]

Solemn Session of Union of the Greeks, 6 Jul. 1439 / Bull of union drafted, promulgated, and accepted in Latin and Greek, 6 Jul. 1439

Concerning the union of the Armenians, Andreas de Sancta Cruce adds the text of their bull of union of 22 Nov. 1439.

1. First Common Session of Latins and Greeks. 9 April 1438.

Andreas de S. Cruce describes the arrival of the Greek Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople at Venice and Ferrara and their solemn reception, and the first common conciliar session of Latins and Greeks, and appends two documents: the first, called the mandate of the patriarch, preserved nowhere else; the second, the decree of the above-mentioned session of 9 April 1438. Finally he says a few words about the private disputations of the Latin and Greek deputies on Purgatory. Although the two Greek histories of the Council of Florence — namely the *Description* and Syropoulos — have left extensive accounts of the reception of the Greeks at Venice and Ferrara, of the public session of 9 April 1438, and of the private disputations on Purgatory, nonetheless the description of Andreas de S. Cruce has its own value. Indeed, as I have already said, he alone provides the text of the mandate of the patriarch. It is useful to add here that the original Latin-Greek diploma containing the conciliar decree is still preserved.

2. Second Session of Latins and Greeks. 9 October 1438.

Andreas de S. Cruce describes the second common public session of Latins and Greeks at Ferrara most extensively. He indicates precisely the historical circumstances of this session, gives the names of the Latin and Greek deputies for the disputation, gives the text of the first orator — namely Bessarion — then the text of the speech of Andreas (Chrysoberges), Archbishop of Rhodes, and also notes the role of the common interpreter Nicolaus (Sagundinus); finally he gives the text of the dialogue between Mark Eugenicus and Andreas Chrysoberges. Concerning the chronology of this session there is a difficulty between Andreas de S. Cruce and Syropoulos, who assigns the date of 6 October; a still greater difficulty exists between Andreas de S. Cruce and the Greek Acts, which assign different dates, with the Acts of the Greek notaries themselves recording 8 and 13 October and dividing this single session of Andreas de S. Cruce into two sessions.

3. Third Session of Latins and Greeks. 13 October 1438.

Andreas de S. Cruce briefly indicates the theme of this public session — namely the manner of proceeding in the public disputations — and the statements of the Latin and Greek orators on that question, which was remitted to the deputation for finding a solution.

4. Fourth Session of Latins and Greeks. 16 October 1438.

What Andreas de S. Cruce only briefly hints at is narrated more fully in the Greek Acts: how the Latins made two concessions to the Greeks on the question of the manner of proceeding in the disputations, namely precedence and the faculty of reciting even longer texts for arguments. These two authors assign 15 October as the date for the conclusion of this controversy, while Syropoulos indicates 14 October.

On the basis of this established order of proceeding, Mark Eugenicus was able to begin the controversy of the question — whether it was lawful to add a formula to the Nicene Creed — and to bring forward long citations of texts in the public session of 16 October. These texts, like the speech itself, were delivered in the Greek language and afterward translated into Latin. In this session Cardinal Cesarini, after Mark Eugenicus had the definition of the **VII**th ecumenical council recited, presented an ancient Latin codex of this council, in which the *Filioque* was — according to the cardinal's assertion — proven also by the testimony of the *Martinian Chronicle* (Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*). The cardinal — something which Andreas de S. Cruce does not mention — evidently alluded to the letter of Patriarch Tarasius to Pope Hadrian **I**. The session lasted a very long time, so that Andreas de S. Cruce ended his account with these words (fol. 26v): *When these things had been set forth, we all rose, it now being the twenty-first hour.*

5-6. Fifth and Sixth Sessions of Latins and Greeks. 20 and 25 October 1438.

Concerning these two sessions Andreas de S. Cruce has very little; he only presents the fact of the two sessions and the name of the orator — namely Andreas Chrysoberges — and the reasons why he did not reproduce the two speeches of this archbishop. He indicates the reasons in this manner (fol. 27r): *The two conferences of the Lord Archbishop of Colossae I did not trouble to record, because they were not formally collected; but since in the seventh conference (= the eighth session of 4 November) he himself repeated all the same things, they were therefore not recorded here — but look there for what he said, where he declared what he had expressed here in a confused manner.* But from the Greek Acts these two speeches and their citations can be excellently reconstructed in summary; and to them can be added what Andreas de S. Cruce reported for 4 November.

7. Seventh Session of Latins and Greeks. 1 November 1438.

Andreas de S. Cruce presents the text of the speech of the principal orator of this session — namely Bessarion — who first briefly repeated the earlier statements of Andreas Chrysoberges and then gave a response. This speech of Bessarion, according to Syropoulos and according to Georgios Scholarios, was composed by Georgios Scholarios, who was then still a layman (later patriarch). The Greek Acts also provide the text at length in the Greek language.

8. Eighth Session of Latins and Greeks. 4 November 1438.

In this session, according to Andreas de S. Cruce and the Greek Acts, there is a dialogue between Bessarion and Cardinal Cesarini, and the text of these speeches is given by Andreas and in the Greek Acts.

9. Ninth Session of Latins and Greeks. 8 November 1438.

Andreas de S. Cruce and the Greek Acts transmit to us the text or Greek version of the Latin orator of this session — namely Ludovico (of Pirano), Bishop of Forlì, O.F.M. The former also records the very brief dialogues of Cardinal Cesarini and Bessarion, by which they interrupted the orator, and the excellent impression of the speech on the listeners and the most gracious words of Bessarion toward the orator. Certainly Andreas de S. Cruce expressed the text of Ludovico of Forlì's speech

more fully, while the Greek Acts reproduce only about half of it and Syropoulos has almost nothing about it.

10. Tenth Session of Latins and Greeks. 11 November 1438.

Andreas de S. Cruce is the sole author who transmits to us a sufficiently long continuation of the speech of Ludovico of Forlì begun in the preceding session. Together with the Greek Acts he transmits to us the speech begun by Cardinal Cesarini on the question of the Creed and continued in the four following sessions, namely 18 Nov. and 4, 8, 13 December. Syropoulos has nothing about Ludovico's second part of the speech, but only a few words about the dialogue between Cesarini and Mark Eugenicus. The speech of Cardinal Cesarini has also been transmitted to us independently of Andreas de S. Cruce and the Greek Acts, and indeed in a full form.

11. Eleventh Session of Latins and Greeks. 18 November 1438.

Andreas de S. Cruce assigns the date of the 11th, Syropoulos the 18th of November for the conciliar session, as do the Greek Acts. Mark Eugenicus is the first orator of this session, who gives a response to the statements also given in writing to the Greeks and accepted by them by Cardinal Cesarini in the preceding assembly — and indeed in the form of questions posed to the cardinal. This prince of the Church declared himself ready to fulfill these desires of Mark Eugenicus, but with the clause (fol. 46r): *I respond with this condition: that if my response in responding were not sufficient, this should not prejudice the truth, or others.* Andreas de S. Cruce and the Greek Acts make us certain of this matter; for they report the dialogue of Mark Eugenicus and the cardinal at sufficient length, while Syropoulos only hints at it.

12. Twelfth Session of Latins and Greeks. 27 November 1438.

Concerning this session Andreas de S. Cruce has almost nothing — probably because in this session nothing was treated between Latins and Greeks concerning the Creed, but only the solemn reception of the legates of Burgundy before the

council and their speeches were dealt with. Only in describing the thirteenth session of 4 December 1438 does he indicate the names of the Burgundian legates and present to us the speech of one legate — namely the Abbot General of the Cistercians — which however is better ascribed to the twelfth session. Concerning this, Andreas de S. Cruce has the merit of being the only one to insert the text of this speech into the acts of the Council of Florence, while neither the Greek Acts nor Syropoulos present this text. Nevertheless the full text of this speech, preserved beyond the acts of the Council of Florence, has been found and edited by me elsewhere. Concerning the ceremonial difficulties which the reception of the legates presented to the Emperor, Andreas de Santacroce has something at the beginning of the thirteenth session; likewise the Greek Acts already in the eleventh session, while the Greek Description and Syropoulos describe these matters more fully in the same place.

13. Thirteenth Session of Latins and Greeks. 4 December 1438.

Andreas de S. Cruce somewhat incorrectly inserts into this session — as I have already said above — the speech of the Burgundian legate, the Abbot General of the Cistercians. At least this must be retained: that at the beginning of this session the difficulties that had previously arisen between the Burgundian legates and the Greek Emperor had been happily overcome — something which Andreas also hints at and which the author of the Greek Description describes in fuller manner. The following dialogue between Mark Eugenicus and Cardinal Cesarini is described by Andreas de S. Cruce and by the author of the Greek Description, though by the latter somewhat more briefly. The former author also excels in this, that he diligently noted five interruptions by the Emperor in this discussion.

14. Fourteenth Session of Latins and Greeks. 8 December 1438.

Andreas de S. Cruce first reports some words of the Greek Emperor on the manner of proceeding in the discussions and the response of Cardinal Cesarini, then the discussion between Mark Eugenicus and Cesarini, in which the latter discourses at length. The session, according to Andreas de S. Cruce, lasted until the 23rd hour,

having begun at the 24th hour (fol. 80v), *with all being agitated by cold, hunger, and attention*. Syropoulos has nothing about this session. The Greek Description provides only a most brief summary of the matters of this session in a single page.

15. Fifteenth Session of Latins and Greeks. 13 December 1438.

Andreas de S. Cruce alone describes this session, and in the fullest manner, while some things — namely the words of Mark Eugenicus reported at the beginning of this session by Andreas de S. Cruce — are assigned by the author of the Greek Description to the preceding session. These words of Mark Eugenicus are directed against the eight chapters of the speech of Cardinal Cesarini delivered at the preceding conciliar assembly, which contained 28–30 chapters, and concerned texts of the councils. At the end of his speech Mark Eugenicus has an exhortation on preserving the Creed, and this exposition is presented both by Andreas de S. Cruce and by the author of the Greek Description. The cardinal refutes at sufficient length, in the form of a dialogue, the arguments of Mark Eugenicus, with explanation of many canonistic, patristic, and conciliar texts. This session too lasted, according to Andreas de S. Cruce, until the 23rd hour, entering into the 24th (fol. 80v), *all being troubled by cold, hunger, and attention*.

16. Sixteenth Session of Latins and Greeks. 10 January 1439.

Andreas de S. Cruce briefly reports of this last Ferrarese session how a new object for conciliar deliberations was established — namely that one should treat no longer of the Creed but of the Procession of the Holy Spirit itself — and how it was decided that this matter would be treated at Florence, since the danger of plague was threatening at Ferrara. He himself gives the text of the decree of the session of 10 January 1439 on the translation of the council to Florence. Also the author of the Greek Description gives the text of the bull of the last Ferrarese session, but imperfectly. This author, like Syropoulos, has much to say about the preliminaries of the translation of the council — namely the discussions among the Greeks themselves before their consent was given to this decree. The treaty

between the pope and Florence concluded on 18 December on the freedom and security of the council has been transmitted to us elsewhere.

17. Acts at Florence between Latins and Greeks. 26 February to 6 July 1439.

Before the particular session of 26 February 1439, Andreas de S. Cruce describes for us how the Greeks were solemnly received at Florence, and he adds a letter of Eugene **IV** by which he announces to the princes the council already translated from Florence and urges them to render assistance by sending legates and prelates to attend the council. The author of the Greek Description also describes the solemn departure of the Pope from Ferrara and his journey to Florence, the solemn entry of the Greek patriarch into Florence, and after three days the solemn reception of the Emperor; Syropoulos does the same in similar fashion.

18. Particular Session. 26 February 1439.

While Syropoulos and the Greek Acts already designate this session as the first public Florentine session, more correctly Andreas de S. Cruce notes that it only dealt with the deliberation of a deputation of 40 Latin synodal fathers and 40 Greek synodal fathers, on the manner of proceeding in the public Florentine sessions, on the subject matter, and on the time.

19. First Public Florentine Session on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. 2 March 1439.

The principal orator of this session was Johannes de Montenegro (Montenero, of a Genoese family), O.P., whose words are recorded by Andreas de S. Cruce and by the notaries of the Greek Acts. After an introduction on the method he follows, he brought forward the Greek Fathers — Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen — sometimes questioning Mark Eugenicus and quickly and indeed often responding to the questions posed to him by this

metropolitan. Beyond these expositions, Andreas de S. Cruce notes the assistance rendered to the Latin orator by Ambrogio, General of the Camaldolese. The Greek Acts record that Brother Andreas (Archbishop of Rhodes) recited a passage of Basil and Epiphanius in Greek — something which also agrees with a certain note of Andreas de S. Cruce, though he omits the name of the one reciting; only here he is silent about the recitation of Basil. The question of Bessarion to Johannes de Montenegro in the same session and the response are indicated only in the Acts. Syropoulos has almost nothing about this and the following public sessions of the month of March.

20. Second Public Florentine Session on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. 5 March 1439.

Andreas de S. Cruce and the Greek Acts inform us extensively about this session. The Latin orator Johannes de Montenegro and Mark Eugenicus dispute with each other about the meaning of a certain passage of Pseudo-Basil in the fifth book against Eunomius; but because of the difficulty that arose from the diverse theological formation of both parties, the Latin orator was compelled to explain several theological concepts familiar to the Latins. Recourse was always had to the original Greek text, which was publicly recited, and to the context; also a certain passage from Book **III** against Eunomius was cited in order to draw out the sense of Basil. But precisely this passage would be the object of the discussions of the later sessions. Also in this session the Greek Acts have Bessarion asking something of the Latin orator — a matter about which and about whose response nothing is said in Andreas de S. Cruce.

21. Third Public Florentine Session on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. 7 (8) March 1439.

Andreas de S. Cruce differs in chronology from the Greek Acts; the former assigns 8 March, the latter more correctly 7 March for this session, about whose acts both authors nonetheless have much to say in agreement. The center of the disputation between Mark Eugenicus and Johannes de Montenegro is placed in the authenticity

of the passage of Basil, *Against Eunomius*, Book **III**, chap. 1 (Migne PG 161, 326 A-B), either to be denied (Eugenicus) or to be demonstrated (Montenegro):

Reading of the Latins: Τίς γάρ ἀνάγκη, τῷ ἀξιώματι τρίτον καί τῇ τάξει ἐστί τό Πνεῦμα, τρίτον καί τῇ φύσει εἶναι; Τῷ γάρ ἀξιώματι δεύτερον τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἐξ αὐτοῦ τό εἶναι ἔχον καί ἐξ αὐτοῦ λαμβάνον καί ὅλως τῆς αὐτῆς αἰτίας ἐξημμένον ὁ τῆς εὐσεβείας παραδίδωσι λόγος.

(For what necessity is there, if the Spirit is third in dignity and in order, for it to be third also in nature? For it is second in dignity to the Son, having its being from Him and receiving from Him and wholly dependent upon the same cause, as the teaching of piety hands down.)

Reading of the Greeks: Τίς γάρ ἀνάγκη, εἰ τῷ ἀξιώματι τρίτον καί τῇ τάξει ἐστί τό Πνεῦμα, τρίτον καί τῇ φύσει εἶναι; Τῷ γάρ ἀξιώματι δεύτερον εἶναι τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἴσως ὁ τῆς εὐσεβείας παραδίδωσι λόγος.

(For what necessity is there, if the Spirit is third in dignity and in order, for it to be third also in nature? For to be second in dignity to the Son, perhaps the teaching of piety hands down.)

Johannes de Montenegro demanded for this reading the Cusan codex (of Nicholas of Cusa) brought from Constantinople; furthermore he affirmed that there was no practice among the Latins of falsifying codices, while such examples had occurred in the East — for example, in the times of the Council of Ephesus; also the context of Basil coheres with the text. Eugenicus on the contrary asserted that in Constantinople there were 4 or 5 codices containing the shorter text; that falsifications had also occurred in the West — for example, in the times of Pope Zosimus in the question of a certain pretended canon of the Council of Nicaea; and that Basil in his letter to his brother Gregory of Nyssa had taught differently from the sense of the text accepted by the Latins. Johannes insists that the authors of the schism in the East were the cause of the falsification, and that the papal letters recited at Ferrara by Cardinal Cesarini speak of the original Latin and Greek text of the acts of the Council of Nicaea in the papal archive; and that the sense of Basil's letter to Gregory of Nyssa is different.

In the course of the disputation the Latin orator, addressing the Byzantine Emperor (at least according to the Greek Acts), explained how much importance philosophical and theological terminology possesses, and expounded above all the concept of nature, following Aristotle and the Fathers Athanasius, Basil, and Augustine. In this way he wished to establish the sense of the word "nature" in the above-cited passage of Basil.

22. Fourth Public Florentine Session on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. 10 March 1439.

According to Andreas de S. Cruce and the Greek Acts, the discussion again took place in this session between Mark Eugenicus and Johannes de Montenegro on whether the citation from St. Basil, *Against Eunomius*, Book **III**, chap. 1, is authentic. Andreas de S. Cruce also noted that the codex of Dorotheos of Mytilene contained that text of Basil, and that Cardinal Cesarini said (fol. 99v): *Here in this city there are three books and two support our position*. The Byzantine Emperor asserted (fol. 99v): *We established yesterday that in Constantinople the situation is not thus*.

The precious and sufficiently concrete account that Andreas de S. Cruce gave — in agreement with the Greek Acts (Gill 327) — of the speech of Johannes de Montenegro, who also brought forward a homily of St. Basil in favor of the Latin position and the Latin version of Hugo Aetherius, is as follows. Here are his words (fols. 99v–100r): *The Provincial (Johannes de Montenegro)... Likewise we have this authority translated in the time of Alexander the Third, which is more than three hundred years ago... When I was some time ago at the house of the Lord of Santa Sabina (Cesarini) and Brother Ambrogio (Traversari) was with us — who has a good gift of interpretation and who reads the Latin language from Greek writings as easily as if they were in Latin — a very ancient Greek book on parchment was brought, containing many works of Basil; it was produced by a certain expert interpreter of Greek letters, by name Leonardo Aretino, chancellor of this city. While Brother Ambrogio had the book and we were looking for the letter of Basil, a homily of the same author on the Holy Spirit appeared; I had it read, hoping that if Basil had said anything anywhere about the Holy Spirit, he*

would say it also there. I heard it all, and when it came to this passage, I gave thanks to the Holy Spirit.

Mark Eugenicus, against the Latins, first adduced St. John the Evangelist and the Fathers Athanasius and Gregory Nazianzen, while Johannes de Montenegro reserved his argumentation from Sacred Scripture for another session and in the meantime insisted most of all on the testimonies of the Greek Fathers — above all Basil and Athanasius — but even here he did not yet complete the full patristic argumentation, which would be made by him in the two sessions of 21 and 24 March.

Andreas de S. Cruce records a short narrative of the following dialogue between the Emperor (indignant at the lengthy exposition of Johannes) and Johannes de Montenegro (fol. 102r): *Emperor: You know that we agreed that those disputing should respond to questions briefly; here so many words have been spoken that we do not know where to begin, and the days would not suffice, and it seems that in the next session we should proceed more briefly. The Provincial: I am lengthy because the proposition is lengthy.* The Greek Acts also record the Emperor's words almost verbatim, but are silent about the response of Johannes de Montenegro.

23. Fifth Public Florentine Session on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. 14 March 1439.

The dialogue between Mark Eugenicus and Johannes de Montenegro is reproduced in agreement by Andreas de S. Cruce and by the notaries of the Greek Acts. Again the discussion concerned St. Basil. But a certain passage of a homily of St. Basil led the disputants from the theme of the Procession of the Holy Spirit to the question of the gifts of the Holy Spirit — something which also displeased the Emperor, so that he treated with the pope about it, and indeed with success. The declaration of Johannes de Montenegro on the single principle of spiration in the Holy Trinity served as a bridge toward better mutual understanding.

24. Sixth Public Florentine Session on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. 17 March 1439.

Andreas de S. Cruce and the Greek Acts report well on the very lengthy exposition of Mark Eugenicus against the doctrine of the *Filioque*, with the recitation of texts from Sacred Scripture and the Greek Fathers, and on the dialogue between him and Johannes de Montenegro — interrupted at times by Cardinal Cesarini and the Emperor. Mark Eugenicus returned again to the celebrated citation from chapter one of the third book against Eunomius. But the Dominican orator spoke of the value of ancient manuscripts in support of the Latin position; Cardinal Cesarini affirmed something similar. Again the Greeks were told that the Catholic Church acknowledges a single principle of spiration in the Holy Trinity. Cardinal Cesarini closed the session with these words, noted by Andreas de S. Cruce (fol. 114v): *Enough for now, since the Lord of Ephesus was lengthy in his response.*

25. Seventh Public Florentine Session on the Procession of the Holy Spirit.
21 March 1439.

The sole orator of this session was Johannes de Montenegro, because — according to the declaration of the Emperor given by Andreas de S. Cruce and also by the author of the Greek Description — the Greeks were not ready to carry out a disputation, and Mark Eugenicus himself was absent. The Latin speech appears to be integrally preserved in the very narrative of Andreas de S. Cruce, while the author of the Greek Description gives us only a summary of this speech. The theme of the Latin orator was the demonstration of the Catholic doctrine of the *Filioque*; he brought forward many arguments with his own explanations from Sacred Scripture and from the Latin Fathers Augustine, Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, Fulgentius (Pseudo-Augustine), Isidore (of Seville), Gregory the Great, John the Deacon, and Leo the Great; from the writer Boethius; and from the ecumenical councils of Chalcedon and Constantinople **III**, and from the particular councils of Toledo.

26. Eighth Public Florentine Session on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. 24
March 1439.

Again the sole orator of this session was Johannes de Montenegro, whose very lengthy speech has been transmitted to us by Andreas de S. Cruce, while the author of the Greek Description provides only about one page concerning the speech. The orator set before the synodal fathers, in support of the Catholic doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, testimonies with explanations from the Greek Fathers: Basil, Epiphanius, Didymus, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Gregory Nazianzen. The impression which the orator excited in the listeners is described thus by Andreas de S. Cruce (fols. 130r–130v): *When these things had been set forth, a very great silence was perceived when the speech ended; for while the master was speaking, everyone had been intent upon his words.* Isidore, metropolitan of Kiev, desired the speeches written out of this and the preceding session, in which the orator had spoken (fol. 130v) *for eight hours and more.* The Emperor too, as the author of the Greek Description notes, made the same request. Their desire was fulfilled according to the declaration of Cardinal Cesarini. It is still useful to note — what we know from Andreas de S. Cruce — that the authorities of the Greek Fathers were recited in the original text by Ambrogio, General of the Camaldolese.

27. Acts Concerning the Union of the Greeks before the Agreement on the First Article of the Decree of Union, on the Formula of Agreement, on the Death of the Greek Patriarch and his Testament. From April to 10 June 1439.

The public Florentine sessions on the union of the Greeks ceased at the end of March; only on 6 July 1439 was a public and definitive session celebrated, in which the union was promulgated. But strenuous labor was also carried out outside the sessions for the union — both on the Latin side and on the Greek side; there was no lack of particular sessions of the Greeks themselves separately, and of the Latins separately; there was no lack of various occasions of moral contact between the deputations of both parties; there was no lack of zeal on the part of the pope himself, who energetically promoted the work of union by various means. In Andreas de S. Cruce nothing is recorded about the separate sessions of the Greeks, of which we are informed by the Greek authors; but about the separate sessions of the Latins we are excellently informed by him, as also about the reciprocal negotiations between the pope and the Latin and Greek deputies.

Andreas de S. Cruce informs us about the last acts before the agreement of Latins and Greeks on the first article of the decree of union — namely on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. First he gives us a brief general overview of the acts between the Emperor, the pope, and others. Then he gives the text of the speech of the pope delivered on 1 June 1439 to the Greeks, with the Latins also present. Also the author of the Greek Description speaks of this speech, but gives perhaps the more correct chronology of 27 May. The pope speaks of his zeal for accomplishing the union, complains of the slackening of zeal for union in the hearts of the Greeks who were previously better disposed, and finally speaks of the spiritual and temporal benefit of the union. The response of Isidore, metropolitan of Russia, as most briefly recorded by Andreas de S. Cruce, was not negative, but was joined with some hope. What the Greeks did among themselves after this speech we know above all from the author of the Greek Description. Andreas de S. Cruce only informs us of the good report spread about that the movement for union had grown greatly among the Greeks, and of the public votes of the Greeks — with the exception of Mark Eugenicus — made with the consent of the patriarch and emperor, in favor of the Catholic doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit. Indeed he provides us with the text of the formula of agreement accepted by them, which agrees almost word for word with the first chapter of the future decree of union of the Greeks; Syropoulos also gives us this first formula of agreement in full.

Andreas de S. Cruce praises the merits of the Greek patriarch for the union, notes his death on 10 June 1439, and likewise his honorable burial in the church of Santa Maria Novella — indeed together with the verses inscribed upon his tomb.

28. On the Acts of Latins and Greeks Concerning the Articles of the Decree of Union of the Greeks after the Death of the Patriarch up to 5 July 1439.

Andreas de S. Cruce — about whose work I must treat above all — has much to say about the acts between 10 June and 5 July 1439 concerning the decree of union of the Greeks, to be prepared both remotely and proximately. His value consists in the description of the things presented by the Latins for this cause, and especially in presenting the texts of the preliminary formulas and of the speeches of the Latin orators. He is excellently supplemented by the author of the Greek Description, and sometimes — though rarely — also by Syropoulos.

Just as Andreas de S. Cruce has already provided us with the text of the preliminary formula on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, so he also gives us the text of the other preliminary formulas on the other articles of the decree of union of the Greeks.

With the preliminary formula on Purgatory he joins the speech of Giuliano Cesarini already delivered at Ferrara, which demonstrates from Sacred Scripture, from Tradition, and from theological reasoning the formula on Purgatory found in the profession of faith of Michael Palaeologus. Although Andreas de S. Cruce says nothing about the Florentine circumstances of this question, his text of the speech of Giuliano Cesarini was until the year 1920 the only known text, until the Most Reverend Ludovicus Petit published the Greek version of this speech contemporary with the council, and a few years later the author of this book discovered and published the full Latin text independent of the tradition of Andreas de S. Cruce.

Andreas de S. Cruce gives us the text of the preliminary formulas on the Creed (the addition to the Creed), on the matter of the eucharistic consecration, on the Primacy, and on the rights of the patriarchs. He then presents to us the texts of the two speeches of Johannes de Montenegro on the Primacy and of the two speeches of Johannes de Torquemada on the matter and form of the Eucharist, not neglecting certain circumstances of these speeches.

29. First Speech of Johannes de Montenegro on the Primacy. 16 June 1439.

While Syropoulos says nothing about this speech and the author of the *Praktika* history offers only a few words, Andreas de S. Cruce provides a long speech that constitutes a small treatise on the arguments for the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff. These are drawn from Sacred Scripture, from the Fathers Augustine, Leo the Great, and John Chrysostom, from the councils of Chalcedon and Constantinople **III** and **IV**, and from four letters of the Pseudo-Isidorian collection. The writer did not fail to narrate the circumstances of the speech: the presence of the pope, the Emperor, his brother Demetrius, Cardinal Cesarini, some Greek metropolitans and some Latin synodal fathers; the interruption of the speech by Cardinal Cesarini, who added two arguments — namely from John Chrysostom and the letter of Pope Agatho — and reminded the orator that he had omitted some words of the preliminary formula that needed explanation, which illustration was the duty of the

orator. Also after the speech, Cesarini added a certain passage from the **VIII**th council. Immediately after the speech on the Primacy, Johannes de Torquemada had to explain the preliminary formula on the Holy Eucharist — namely on its matter and form.

30. First Speech of Johannes de Torquemada on the Most Holy Eucharist. 16 June 1439.

Andreas de S. Cruce alone informs us well about this speech; the author of the Greek Description only indicates the theme of the speech and does not reveal the name of the orator — indeed he incorrectly has Ambrogio (Traversari) speaking. On the matter of the Most Holy Eucharist, Johannes de Torquemada proposed arguments from Sacred Scripture and from Pseudo-Gregory the Great. On the form of the Holy Eucharist he cited the Fathers Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Ambrose, Augustine, John Chrysostom, and John of Damascus. With positive arguments the orator combines speculative considerations on the fittingness of Catholic doctrine. He explicitly acknowledges the validity and licitness for the Greeks of the use of leavened bread, although he judges it more becoming and more reasonable to use unleavened bread for the consecration of the Eucharist. Andreas de S. Cruce says that the pope exhorted the Greeks after the speech of Johannes de Torquemada to accept the formulas of the Latin deputation. But the Emperor declared that he wished to consider these formulas further with his own people.

31. Second Speech of Johannes de Montenegro, O.P., on the Primacy. 20 (or already 18) June 1439.

Andreas de S. Cruce alone gives the text of this speech and the occasion for it. The Greeks desired some clarifications of the doubts they had about the earlier speech of Johannes on the Primacy, and the pope offered the Greeks the opportunity to be instructed by Johannes de Montenegro. He demonstrated that the decretal letters of the Roman Pontiffs can be well adduced as arguments, since even the ecumenical councils have praised them. The primacy of the pope is not a mere honor, but a power of jurisdiction. The pope has the power to convoke ecumenical councils. The power of the pope extends not only mediately but also immediately to all the faithful, bishops, metropolitans, and patriarchs. He drew his citations from the

ecumenical councils, from the authentic letters of popes Leo I, John II, Martin I, and Agatho, sometimes also from the Pseudo-Isidorian collection, from the Fathers St. Augustine and St. John Chrysostom, and indeed also from the civil laws of Justinian I. Cardinal Cesarini, who had a brief dialogue with a certain Greek — an "Arathenian" — cited John Chrysostom and the apocryphal Donation of Constantine, both of which passages were recited in Greek. Afterward Johannes de Torquemada delivered his second speech on the Holy Eucharist.

32. Second Speech of Johannes de Torquemada on the Most Holy Eucharist.
20 (or already 18) June 1439.

The sole author who has transmitted this speech to us is Andreas de S. Cruce. Johannes de Torquemada publicly treated at length of the form of the Most Holy Eucharist — namely the words of consecration. He drew his arguments from Sacred Scripture, from the Latin Fathers Ambrose and Augustine, from the Greek Fathers Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Basil, John Chrysostom, John of Damascus, and the Byzantine Liturgy, and from the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas. Also Pseudo-Eusebius of Emesa and Pseudo-Augustine (= Paschasius Radbertus) were cited by him. After the speech there followed questions from the Greeks on the same theme — above all from Isidore of Kiev — to which the Dominican theologian responded, with Cardinal Cesarini also briefly speaking on one occasion. The pope gave the Greeks some words of exhortation to embrace the Union.

33. Acts between Latins and Greeks on 26 June 1439.

According to the narrative of Andreas de S. Cruce and also of the Greek Description — which is nonetheless less complete than the former author — a session of cardinals and Latin prelates was held in the apostolic palace (at Santa Maria Novella), while in another hall of the same palace the Greeks in the meantime were waiting. Cardinal Branda of Piacenza disclosed to the Latin synodal fathers that, according to the desire of the Greek Emperor for promoting the business of the union, six deputies were to be chosen on the part of both the Latins and the Greeks, who would treat with the pope and the Emperor about the conclusion of the Union, and that if difficulties arose they would be referred before the synodal fathers and resolved by common opinion. On the part of the Latins

there were appointed as deputies: Cardinal Cesarini, the bishops of Théroutanne (Morini) and León, and three theologians — Johannes de Montenegro, O.P., Johannes de Torquemada, O.P., and Thomas of Sarzana (Parentucelli, the future pope under the name of Nicholas V). The six Latin deputies rose and approached the pope; the remaining synodal fathers stayed in their places. The Greek Emperor was asked to send six deputies; he designated four metropolitans — three of whose names are indicated by Andreas — namely those of Heraclea, "of Russia" (Isidore of Kiev), Nicaea (Bessarion), and two presbyters. Before these 12 deputies — six Latin and six Greek — who had in the meantime been with the pope for a long time, and before the other Latin synodal fathers, the Cardinal of Santa Sabina (Cesarini), it now being the 17th hour, announced that the next session would take place on the following day. Since (fol. 149v) *the heat was very great beyond midday... and the hour was now the 18th*, there was offered to the Latins and Greeks assembled there some drink (?) and a refreshing collation of spirit for those who wished it.

34. Session of the Latins. 27 June 1439.

The sole author who treats of the session of the Latins held in the presence of the Pope before midday on 27 June 1439 in the apostolic palace (at Santa Maria Novella) is Andreas de S. Cruce. He narrates how Cardinal Cesarini gives a historical overview of the entire business of the Union treated at the Council of Florence, of the difficulties of the Greeks that had been overcome, and of the five principal articles already accepted by the Greeks. He recites the text of these articles and also announces that the Greeks would make a declaration in public session concerning the words of consecration. The pope praises what the Latin deputies had done in the cause of these articles, and determines that the Latin synodal fathers should that same evening at the 20th hour elect four deputies from each of the three estates of the council — namely 1. cardinals, archbishops, and bishops; 2. abbots and proctors of the Orders; 3. doctors among the clergy and prelates — who would treat together with the 12 Greek deputies about the final redaction of the bull of Union on the already accepted basis of the five articles.

35. On the Final Redaction of the Bull of Union of the Greeks. 28 June to 4 July 1439.

Concerning the time and place of the deputation and the number of Latin and Greek deputies for the final redaction of the decree of union of the Greeks, what is recorded in Andreas de S. Cruce is almost entirely absent from the two Greek histories of the Council of Florence. On the other hand, in these two books — above all in the Greek Description — there are discussions on certain points which Andreas does not have.

Andreas assigned exactly the time of the discussions — namely morning and evening from 28 June to 4 July — the place, namely the sacristy of the church of St. Francis (Santa Croce), and the number of twelve deputies for each party. Finally he alone noted that on 4 July 1439 in the same named place the Latin and Greek text of the bull was read and unanimously accepted.

36. Session of the Latins. 4 July 1439.

According to Andreas de S. Cruce, on the evening of 4 July 1439 a session of the Latins was held in the presence of the pope in the apostolic palace. The Cardinal of Santa Sabina (Cesarini) gave a report on the acts of the Latin and Greek deputations between 28 June and the morning of 4 July, which had reached agreement on the text of the bull of union of the Greeks. The pope had this text — composed in Latin and Greek — publicly read by the apostolic subdeacon Thomas (Parentucelli, who became pope under the name of Nicholas V). With this text — probably only the Latin text as recited — the pope gave thanks to God for the accomplished work of union and praised the deputies. Since the decree is in agreement, said the Supreme Pontiff, with the articles already previously accepted with the consent of all the synodal fathers, it is approved by the law itself; he then indicates that the solemn session (on this decree) will take place on the feast of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul in the cathedral church, where he himself will celebrate Mass. These notices have special value, since neither the *Praktika* nor Syropoulos speak of this session.

37. Declaration of the Greeks against the Epiclesis as Conceived in a Dissenting Sense. 5 July 1439.

Among the contemporary historical authors it is above all Andreas de S. Cruce, and from other documents uniquely the original protocol redacted on 17 August

1439 on the same matter, that report to us the public declaration of the Greeks on the words of eucharistic consecration against the schismatic interpretation of the epiclesis. In the name of the Greeks, Bessarion spoke in the presence of the pope, the Latin synodal fathers, and the greater part of the Greeks on the evening of 5 July in the apostolic palace; in order to remove any suspicion that the Greeks do not believe the Sacrament of the Eucharist to be confectioned by the words of the Lord, he solemnly declares: that following the holy Doctors of the Church — above all St. John Chrysostom — he (fol. 153r) *admits that it is the dominical words that change and transubstantiate that bread into the body of Christ and the wine into the blood*. Furthermore he professed that the matter of consecration is wheaten bread whether leavened or unleavened, the minister is a priest, the form is (as he had already said above) the words of the Lord, and finally the priest must have the intention of consecrating the bread and wine. Syropoulos reports the substance of Bessarion's declaration correctly. The pope expressed his joy at the declaration of Bessarion. The cardinal dean of the Sacred College of Cardinals declared that the Latins agreed with the doctrine recited by Bessarion. Finally Bessarion gives thanks to the Pope.

38. Solemn Promulgation of the Union of the Greeks. 6 July 1439.

Andreas de S. Cruce briefly describes the solemnity of the promulgation of the union of the Greeks. He records that this was celebrated on 6 July in the presence of the Latin and Greek synodal fathers in the cathedral church according to conciliar order; that a great multitude of people together with noble lords had also come to the church, which however could not contain all the faithful. The Latin and Greek synodal fathers paid reverence to the pope before Mass. The Greeks sang the hymn *Veni Creator Spiritus* in the Greek language and attended the Latin Mass of the pope with devotion. After Mass the public conciliar session was opened, with the papal throne placed at the altar and the customary prayers recited. Afterward Cardinal Cesarini of Santa Sabina (Cesarini) read the Latin text of the decree of union of the Greeks, and then the Archbishop of Nicaea (Bessarion) the Greek text. Andreas de S. Cruce presents the Latin text of the bull with the subscriptions of the Latins and the Latin version of the subscriptions of the Greek synodal fathers. The description of Andreas is certainly fuller than the Greek

Description presented in the *Praktika*, and thus excellently supplements the author of that history and agrees excellently with the notices of the Florentine chroniclers.

39. On the Return of the Byzantine Emperor. 26 August 1439.

Andreas de Sanctacruce gives us the exact chronology of the departure of the Greek Emperor (John **VIII** Palaeologus) from the city of Florence — namely on 26 August 1439 — and likewise of the external solemnity with which he was honored by all the cardinals at his departure from Florence and by three cardinals in the remaining territory of the Florentine republic. Neither the author of the Greek Description nor Syropoulos has left us these two precious pieces of information.

40. What Andreas de S. Cruce Reports to Us about the Union of the Armenians.

Although the writer Andreas de S. Cruce says little to us about the union of the Armenians, what he has left us is not to be despised. From him we are informed that (fol. 157v) the articles of faith with the Armenians were treated after the departure of the Greeks until 8 November; about some members of the Latin deputation designated by the pope and the council for these disputations — namely the cardinals of Ostia (Antonio Correr), of Santa Croce (Nicolaus Albergati), and of Santa Sabina (Giuliano Cesarini), and (fol. 157v) *several doctors*; about the place of the disputations, namely the apostolic palace (at Santa Maria Novella); and about their frequency, namely (fol. 157v) *almost daily*. Andreas furthermore presents to us three documents: namely a copy of the letter (5 July 1438) of Constantine, Patriarch of the Armenians, for his orators sent to the council; a copy of the letter of the regent (consul) Paolo Imperiali, residing in the city of Caffa (Theodosia in Crimea), sent to the Supreme Pontiff Eugene **IV** on 1 December 1438; and finally the text of the bull of union of the Armenians, with the subscriptions and Armenian version omitted.

If anyone should compare by comparative study these historical matters transmitted to us by Andreas with the other sources of the Council of Florence, he must acknowledge that certain notices are given uniquely by him; these concern above all the preparatory disputations for the decree on the Armenians. The text of the letter of the consul Paolo Imperiali sent to Eugene **IV** is not known from any

other source. The two other documents are copies not to be despised, certainly already written out in the year 1439.

VII. VERBAL OR NEAR-VERBAL CONCORDANCES BETWEEN SANTACROCE AND THE GREEK ACTS

That the Latin history of the Council of Florence written by Andreas de Sanctacruce is of great importance is already clear from the two preceding chapters (V and VI). But we shall come to know still more deeply that both the historical accounts of Andreas de Sanctacruce and the acts of the Greek notaries (or Greek Acts) contain the greatest value, if the verbal or near-verbal concordances of these two sources, presented in the following tables, are carefully considered by readers. I shall always indicate the characteristic words (or word) of the beginnings and endings of the various parts of the public sessions, and the person speaking. I have not extended my study of comparison to mere allusions or similarities, because from the verbal concordances alone secure conclusions can be drawn.

Public Sessions at Ferrara

SANTACROCE (ed. Hofmann) / ACTA (ed. Gill)

Collation I (8 or 9 Oct. 1438)

1. Eugenicus: *si quid – accommodetur* (40, 5–6) / *ἐάν συμβῇ – λογιστέον* (If it should happen – it must be considered) (49, 10–11)

rev.mi patres – adiunctione (40, 8–9) / *τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ αἰδεσιμότητι – προσθήκης* (To your reverence – of the addition) (49, 14–16)

hec est nostre disputationis intentio – ad diem alium (40, 9–11) / *περὶ ταύτης τῆς ὑποθέσεως – πρὸς ἑτέραν συνέλευσιν* (Concerning this matter – to another assembly) (49)

2. Andreas of Rhodes: *Nos et ipsi rogamus – clara, pura et non dubia (responsa)* (40, 13–15) / *Καὶ ἡμεῖς – τὰς ἀποκρίσεις ποιεῖσθαι καθαρῶς καὶ τελείως, καὶ μὴ .. ἄσαφέσι (λέξεσι)* (And we also – to give the responses clearly and completely, and not in obscure words) (50, 6–15)

3. Eugenicus: *Dominus – schisma* (40, 17–26) / Ὁ κύριος – σχίσμα (The Lord – schism) (51, 16–52, 22)

Nunc – assequi optatum finem (40, 27–36) / νῦν – εἰς τὸ προκείμενον ἔργον (now – to the task at hand) (52, 23–53, 30)

4. Andreas of Rhodes: *Quod secundo – evangelio* (41) / τὸ δεύτερον – εὐαγγέλιον (The second – the gospel) (54, 29–55, 34)
5. Eugenicus: *Romana ecclesia – non satisfaciunt hec quesito* (41, 21) / ἡ ῥωμαϊκὴ ἐκκλησία – οὐκ ἀναγκαῖα πρὸς τὸ λύσαι (The Roman church – not necessary for resolving) (56, 8–9)

diffinitiones antiquorum conciliorum legantur constitutiones – nisi forma (40, 32–24) / ἀναγνώσεως τῶν ὅρων – ἀναγκαιοτάτην (Of the reading of the definitions – most necessary) (56, 29–30)

addiderit – nec a patribus (40, 24–25) / προσθήκην – πατέρων (addition – of the fathers) (57, 10–21)

6. Andreas of Rhodes: *Dico – licite factum est* (41, 29–30) / ἀποδείξομεν – ὡς ἀληθὲς καὶ ἀναγκαῖον προσετέθη (We shall demonstrate – that it was added truly and necessarily) (58, 27–31)

Collation II (13 Oct. 1438)

1. Andreas of Rhodes: *Tue sanctitatis – pridie fuere proposita* (41, 35–36) / τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πατρός – τὰ εἰρημένα κεφάλαια (Of the most blessed father – the aforesaid chapters) (59, 8–9)
2. Cardinal Cesarini: *pacta servantur – posset* (42, 7) / τηρῶνται, αἱ συμφωνίαι – οὐδὲν δύναται γίνεσθαι (Let the agreements be kept – nothing can be done) (61, 1)
3. Johannes de Montenegro: *quilibet servet ordinem – (modus) inquisitionis* (42, 37–40) / δεῖ ... τηρεῖν τὴν τάξιν – συζητήσεως (It is necessary to keep the order – of inquiry) (64, 1–10)
4. Cesarini: *Iubet dominus noster – deputati* (42, 35–49) / ὁρίζει μοι ὁ μακαριώτατος πατήρ – οἱ ἐκλελεγμένοι (The most blessed father commands me – the chosen ones) (65, 1–16)

5. Emperor: *surgamus – de conveniendis* (43, 1) / ἀναστῶμεν – ἵνα διαλέξωνται (Let us rise – so that they may confer) (65, 18–31)

Collation III (16 Oct. 1438)

1. Eugenicus: *Quoniam nobis fuit concessum – conciliorum* (43, 2–7) / ἐνεδόθη – συνόδων (It was granted – of the councils) (66, 12–15)
2. Cesarini: *servare necesse est promissa – nostra parte* (43, 26–30) / δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἵνα φυλάξωμεν τὰς ἡμετέρας συμφωνίας – ἡμετέρας θελήσεως (It is right that we keep our agreements – of our will) (67, 1–11)
3. Eugenicus: *Legemus – prout expedierit* (43, 34–36) / Ἀναγνωσθήσεται – ὅσα ἀνήκει (It shall be read – whatever is appropriate) (67, 14–18)

Rogamus paternitatem vestram – nostram propositionem / παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην – τὰς ἡμετέρας δικαιολογίας (We beseech your charity – our justifications) (67, 29–33)

4. The Nicene (Constantinopolitan) Creed was read (44, 1) / ἀνεγνώσθη τὸ σύμβολον (The creed was read) (68, 2)

While in the Greek Acts the texts of the councils and Fathers are reproduced in full, Santacroce for the most part only alludes to them in this session.

5. Eugenicus: *Duo videntur esse inquirenda – continebatur (symbolum Constantinopolitanum) in primo (Niceno)* (44, 8–41) / δύο ζητῆσαι ἄξιον – δυνάμει τὸ δεύτερον περιέχοντος (Two things are worth inquiring – the second being contained potentially in the first) (69, 24–72, 37)
6. Eugenicus: *Audistis, rev. patres – reiicimus* (45, 34–29) / Ἠκούσατε – ἀποβαλλόμεθα (You have heard – we reject) (86, 2–87, 22)
7. Cesarini: *Quia placet – per notarios scripta auscultentur* (45, 35–36) / ἐπειδὴ ἐζήτησατε – ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὰ ... ἀναγεγραμμένα παρὰ τῶν νοταρίων (Since you have asked – to have read what was written by the notaries) (87, 39–88, 1)

Collation IV (20 Oct. 1438)

Collation V (25 Oct. 1438)

On these two collations Santacroce reports almost nothing.

Collation **VI** (1 Nov. 1438)

1. Bessarion: *Auditis – prohibitio in tertia synodo* (46, 2–50, 9) / ἀκροασάμενοι – ἡ τρίτη σύνοδος (Having listened – the third synod) (138, 4–153, 26)
2. Bessarion: *Secundo dixistis – fidei expositionem* (50, 7) / Δεύτερον εἶπατε – πίστεως ἔννοιαν (Secondly you said – the meaning of faith) (153, 15–16)
3. Bessarion: *Tertio arguistis – non fuerunt adiecte (declarationes)* (50, 10–13) / Τρίτον προστεθέν (Third, having been added) (153, 26–154, 1)

dicitis – ad futurum conventum / ἔτι λέγετε – ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ συνελεύσει (You say further – in the future assembly) (155, 7–156, 14)

Collation **VII** (4 Nov. 1438)

Bessarion: *ad plura – querimus* (51, 31–51, 29) / Πρὸς τὰ πλείω – ζητοῦμεν (As for the more – we seek) (156, 17–160)

Collation **VIII** (8 Nov. 1438)

Johannes, bishop of Forlì: *vos rev. patres – arguitis sic* (56, 13–62, 3) / ὑμεῖς, αἰδεσιμώτατοι πατέρες – ἐπιχειρεῖτε οὕτως (You, most reverend fathers – you attempt thus) (161, 9–176, 31)

Collation **IX** (11 Nov. 1438)

1. Cesarini: *Quia ex utraque parte – disputationes* (72, 24–33) / Ἐπειδὴ ἐξ ἑκατέρου μέρους – παρ' ὑμῶν (Since from each side – among you) (176, 9–177, 19)
2. Emperor: *Dicat – placet* (72, 4) / Εἰπάτω – εἰπάτω (Let him speak – let him speak) (177, 13)
3. Cesarini: *Tangam radicem – symbolum neque Nicenum neque Constantinopolitanum* (72, 35–73, 9) / Ἄψομαι τοίνυν τῆς ρίζης – οὔτε τὸ ἐν Νικαίᾳ (σύμβολον) οὔτε τὸ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει (I shall touch therefore the root – neither the Creed of Nicaea nor that of Constantinople) (177, 14–178, 13)

4. Cesarini: *amovet certa Niceno concilio – cum correptione sanctissimi domini nostri, et imperatoris, et aliorum* (73, 35–76, 31) / αἶρει ἀπὸ τοῦ συμβόλου τοῦ ἐν Νικαίᾳ – ὑπὸ διορθώσει τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ γαληνοτάτου βασιλέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατέρων (He removes from the Creed of Nicaea – under the correction of our most blessed father and lord and of the most serene emperor and of the other fathers) (178, 20–186, 2)

Collation X (18 Nov. 1438)

1. Eugenius: *Nos, amati patres – Interrogo, an ita se habeat argumentum vestrum* (77, 16–78, 9) / Ἡμεῖς, ὧ φίλοι πατέρες – οὕτως ἔχει τὸ σὸν ἐπιχείρημα; (We, dear fathers – is your argument thus?) (187, 7–189, 7)
2. Cesarini: *audivi gratanter – dicam* (78, 12–23) / ἤκουσα ἀσμένως – ἐρῶ (I heard with pleasure – I shall say) (189, 9–190, 9)
3. Eugenius: *non quero – nisi ut dicatis aut sic aut non* (78, 24–26) / οὐ δεόμεθα – ἢ οὐ (We do not ask – or not) (190, 7–15)
4. Emperor: *Isti patres – respondeat alius* (78, 28–31) / Οἱ πατέρες – οἱ ἄλλοι (The fathers – the others) (190, 26–27)
5. Eugenius: *Querimus – breviter respondeatis* (78, 29–31) / Ζητοῦμεν – ἐν ὀλίγοις ... τὰς ἀποκρίσεις εἰπάτω (We seek – let him give the responses briefly) (190, 27–20)
6. Cesarini: *non interrogetis – Dicatis, quicquid vobis placet* (78, 32–37) / μηδὲν ἐρωτᾷς εἰπὲ ὃ χρῆζεις (Ask nothing, say what you wish) (191, 9–20)
7. Eugenius: *Convenistis – Estne ita?* (78, 39–79, 9) / Συνεφώνησας – ἢ ἄλλως; (Have you agreed – or otherwise?) (191, 9–17)
8. Cesarini: *Placet – professio fuit imposita per synodum, vel non?* (79, 9–6) / Ἀρέσκει – ἡ ὁμολογία ἐκείνη ἐδέχθη παρὰ τῆς συνόδου ἢ οὐ; (It pleases – was that profession accepted by the synod or not?) (191, 18–28)
9. Eugenius: *professionem, ut Charisii – non ut catholice fidei* (79, 7–8) / Ἐδέχθη ὡς ἰδία – κοινή (It was accepted as individual – common) (191, 39)
10. Cesarini: *Fecistis duo quesita – expositionem sue fidei* (81, 7) / Δύο τιὰς ἐρωτήσεις ἐποιήσω – τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὁμολογίαν (You made two questions – his own profession) (196, 7–16)

11. Cesarini: *Nunc respondeo – symbolum* (81) / νῦν ἀποκρινοῦμαι – σύμβολον (Now I shall respond – the creed) (197, 23–198, 11)
12. Eugenius: *Illud symbolum – non tetigerunt symbolum* (82, 2–10) / Ἐκεῖνο τὸ σύμβολον – τοῦ συμβόλου οὐχ ἥψαντο (That creed – they did not touch the creed) (198, 24–199, 7)
13. Cesarini: *(in synodo Ephesina) querens (Cyrillus) – ne perdamus tempus* (84, 1–10) / ὁ Κύριλλος ἠρώτησε τὴν σύνοδον – τὸν καιρὸν ἐπὶ ματαίῳ (Cyril asked the synod – time in vain) (204–205, 34)
14. Eugenius: *Nos istos sermones – unio christianorum* (84, 36–86, 17) / Ἡμεῖς ... τοὺς τοιούτους λόγους – ἡ τῶν χριστιανῶν ὁμόνοια (We... such words – the harmony of Christians) (205, 25–206, 14)
15. Cesarini: *Quia tempus est carior res – sicut de illo Filioque* (84, 36–86, 17) / Ἐπειδήπερ ὁ καιρὸς ἐστὶ τὸ ποθεινότατον πρᾶγμα – ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ (Since time is the most precious thing – from the Son) (206, 16–210, 27)
16. Eugenius: *Ad illa, que primo dicta sunt – parati sumus* (86, 23–36) / Πρὸς μὲν τὰ πρότερον εἰρημένα – ἔτοιμοί ἐσμεν (As for the things said before – we are ready) (210, 29–211, 31)
17. Cesarini: *Sunt inter alios articulos – in aliis articulis erimus bene concordēs* (86, 37–87, 7) / Μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἄρθρων – ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁμονοήσομεν (Together with the other articles – in the others we shall be in agreement) (211, 39–212, 17)

Public Florentine Sessions (Collation I, particular session)

Collation I (2 March 1439)

1. Johannes de Montenegro: *Cum benedictione sanctissimi domini nostri – habere debeatis* (135, 19–136, 39) / Μετὰ τῆς εὐλογίας τῆς ἀγιότητος τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πατρός – ἔχειν ὀφείλετε (With the blessing of the holiness of the most blessed father – you ought to have) (250, 22–253, 32)
2. Eugenius: *Rev. patres et domini. Ad prima quidem – que volui respondere* (136, 37–137, 14) / Αἰδεσιμώτατοι κύριοι καὶ πατέρες, πρὸς μὲν τὰ πρῶτα – ὃ ἐβουλόμην, ἀπεκρινάμην (Most reverend lords and fathers, as for the first things – I answered what I wished) (253, 33–254, 32)

3. Johannes: *Intelleximus – quero, si sic intelligitis* (136, 37–137, 24) /
Συνήκαμεν – ἐρωτῶ οὖν, εἰ οὕτω νοεῖς (We understood – I ask therefore
whether you understand thus) (254, 33–255, 22)
4. Eugenius: *Talem – Spiritus sanctus* (137, 26–27) / Τοιαύτην – τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ
ἅγιον (Such a – the Holy Spirit) (255, 23–25)
5. Johannes: *Placet, habemus – procedit a Filio* (137, 29–31) / Ἀρέσκει μοι,
ἔχομεν – ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ (It pleases me, we have – from the Son) (255, 29–256,
3)
6. Johannes: *Placet quod dictum est – a Filio* / Ἀρέσκει μοι τὸ ρηθέν – τοῦ
Υἱοῦ (It pleases me what was said – of the Son) (256, 7–33)
7. Eugenius: *Cum pollicitus – Spiritum accipere esse a Filio* (138, 7–20) /
Ὑποσχόμενος – ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (Having
promised – the Holy Spirit receives from the Son) (256, 34–258, 18)
8. Johannes: *Audivimus que dixisti – capiant esse a Deo?* (138, 31–34) /
Συνήκαμεν τὰ εἰρημένα σοι .. παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ – τὸ εἶναι λαμβάνει; (We
understood what you said to us .. from God – does it receive its being?)
(258, 19–259, 2)
9. Eugenius: *Hoc ita – accipiant esse* (138, 37–39) / Τοῦτο οὕτω – παρ' αὐτοῦ
τὸ εἶναι ἔχει (This is so – it has its being from him) (259, 2–5)
10. Johannes: *Confitemini – a Deo?* (138, 11) / Συγχωρεῖς – παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ; (Do
you grant – from God?) (259, 6–7)
11. Eugenius: *Confitemur – accipiunt esse* (138, 40) / Συγχωρῶ – αἰτίαν ἔχουσι
(I grant – they have a cause) (259, 8–9)
12. Johannes: *in dicto Epiphani – cum dicitur: est (a Filio)* (139, 1–6) / ἐν τῷ
ῥητῷ τοῦ Ἐπιφανίου – ἡνίκα λέγει. Ἐστὶ (In the passage of Epiphanius –
when he says: It is) (259, 32–260, 17)
13. Johannes: *Nemo novit – accipiat esse* (139, 17–25) / Οὐδε ... οἶδεν – ἔχει τὸ
εἶναι (No one knows – it has its being) (260, 18–35)
14. Eugenius: *Dicitis, rev. pater – a persona utriusque?* (139, 26–29) / Λέγει ἡ
σὴ αἰδεσιμότης – ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτῶν; (Your reverence says – from
the hypostasis of each?) (260, 26–34) (264, 20–25)
15. Johannes: *cum dicimus – unum principium ... a Patre in Filium* (139, 30–32)
/ ἡνίκα λέγομεν – ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Υἱόν ἐστὶν (When we say – it
is from the Father and upon the Son) (260, 26–34)

16. Eugenicus: *Dum intelligitis – capiat esse?* (139, 33–38) / Εἰ ... νοεῖται – ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ (If ... it is understood – from his hypostasis) (260, 35–261, 10)
17. Johannes: *Nos intelligimus – Filio qui habet unam substantiam cum Patre* (140, 1–3) / Ἡμεῖς συγχωροῦμεν – ἡ αὐτὴ ἐστὶν οὐσία Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ (We grant – the same substance belongs to Father and Son) (261, 11–15)
18. Eugenicus: *concessistis – iam clare Basilius declaravit a persona Patris tantum* (140, 10–17) / Ἐδωκας ἡμῖν – ἤδη καθαρῶς ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος ἀπεφάνητο ἐκ μόνης τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ Πατρὸς (You have given us – the great Basil has already clearly declared from the hypostasis of the Father alone) (261, 25–262, 7)
19. Johannes: *Quod dicitis – bene facit ad propositum* (140, 18–24) / Ἐν οἷς λέγεις – τὰ ῥήματα ποιοῦσι πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον (In what you say – the words serve the matter at hand) (262, 7–263, 7)
20. Eugenicus: *Querimus – explana* (140, 32–35) / ἐρωτῶμεν – ἀποκρίναι (We ask – answer) (263, 14–23)
21. Eugenicus: *Si vos ostendissetis per auctoritatem Epiphani – Iterum querimus* (141, 3–11) / Εἰ ἀπέδειξας τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἐπιφανίου – πάλιν οὖν ἐρωτῶμεν (If you have proven this from St. Epiphanius – we therefore ask again) (263, 35–264, 19)
22. Eugenicus: *Secundum confessionem – procedere a Patre tantum* (141, 15–17) / Κατὰ τὸ συγκεχωρηκός – ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς εἶναι (According to what has been conceded – to be from the Father alone) (264, 27–265, 7)
23. Johannes: *Ibidem disputat Basilius – secundum testimonium Basilii* (141, 18–24) / Ὅτε ταῦτα ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος – ἡ δὲ δευτέρα τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου (When the great Basil these things – and the second of the great Basil) (264, 37–265, 7)
24. Eugenicus: *Supposuistis – ita vos dixistis / υπέθου – οὕτω ταῦτα λέγεις* (You supposed – you say these things thus) (265, 11–13)
25. Johannes: *ego dixi – ab alio* (141, 29–39) / λέγομεν – ἐκ τινος (We say – from something) (265, 28–32)
26. Johannes: *Dicimus quod essentia et persona sunt unum et idem secundum rem, et differunt secundum modum intelligendi – quomodo intelligitis dictum Basilii?* (142, 6–20) / ἡμεῖς δὲ λέγομεν ὅτι ἡ οὐσία καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἢ ἡ ὑπόστασις εἰσι ταὐτὸν κατὰ τὸ πρᾶγμα, καὶ διαφέρουσι κατὰ τὸν τρόπον τῆς

ἡμετέρας νοήσεως – παρακαλῶ ἵνα εἴπητε ἡμῖν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ῥήτου τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου (And we say that the essence and the person or hypostasis are the same in reality, and differ according to the mode of our understanding – I ask that you tell us also about the passage of the great Basil) (266, 22–267, 19)

27. Eugenius: *Quomodo distinguuntur ab invicem in divinis persona ab essentia – quid vult significare ... a persona* (142, 21–27) / Ὅπως διαφέρουσιν ἀλλήλων οὐσία τε καὶ ὑπόστασις ἐπὶ τῶν θείων – ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως; (How substance and hypostasis differ from each other in divine things – from the hypostasis?) (267, 20–34)
28. Johannes: *Dixi – procedere* (142, 29–143, 12) / Ἐγὼ εἶπον – ἐκπορεύεσθαι (I said – to proceed) (268, 1–269, 22)
29. Eugenius: *Videtis, patres, quod verbum est non iacet – nec colligitur quod proposuistis* (143, 29–27) / βλέπετε, πατέρες, ὅτι τὸ Ἔστιν οὐ πρόσκειται – οὐδὲ συνάγει τὸ παρ' ὑμῶν προτεθέν (You see, fathers, that the word 'is' is not present – nor does it conclude what you proposed) (271, 18–30)
30. Johannes: *Quod hoc verbum est – per processum communicatur esse* (143, 29–36) / Ὅτι οὐ κεῖται τὸ Ἔστιν – λαμβάνειν τὸ εἶναι ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως (That the word 'is' is not present – to receive being because through the procession) (272, 1–20)
31. Eugenius: *Etiam si consideremus – quia consubstantialis* (143, 39–144, 16) / Ὅταν δῶμεν τοῦτο κατὰ συγχώρησιν – ὡς ὁμοούσιον (When we grant this by concession – as consubstantial) (272, 21–273, 27)
32. Johannes: *Ego habeo duo dicta – ideo oportet, quod vos ostendatis (codicem Basilii)* (144, 17–34) / Ἐχὼ δύο – ὀφείλομεν οὖν ἰδεῖν (I have two – we must therefore see) (273, 28–38) (274, 31–275, 7) (276, 16–31)

Collation II (5 March 1439)

1. Johannes de Montenegro: *dimisimus in precedenti congregatione – latine ... legam, et inde in greco, vel e contra* (144, 43–145, 7) / Παρελείψαμεν ἐν τῇ προλαβούσῃ – ἐρῶ πρῶτον τὸ λατινικόν, εἶτα τὸ ἐλληνικόν (We omitted in the preceding – I shall speak first in Latin, then in Greek) (274, 3–29)

2. Johannes: *Basilius vult – Spiritum dicat* (145, 30–34) / ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος βούλεται – λέγει ... τὸ Πνεῦμα (The great Basil wishes – says ... the Spirit) (275, 8–9)
3. Eugenicus: *Auctoritas – ex alia parte* (145, 9) / Τοῦτο – ἐξ ἑτέρου (This – from another) (275, 10)
4. Eugenicus: *Cum Basilius dicit – syllogizassent et ista ostendissent* (146, 7–19) / ὅταν ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος λέγει – συνελογίζοντο τοῦτο καὶ ἀπεδείκνυνον (When the great Basil says – they were reasoning this and demonstrating it) (275, 17–276, 7)
5. Johannes: *Ex verbis tuis – Spiritum* (146, 13–17) / Ἀπὸ τῶν σῶν ῥημάτων – τὸ Πνεῦμα (From your words – the Spirit) (276, 4–14)
6. Eugenicus: *Intentio magni Basilii – non ab extrinseco* (146, 18–23) / ὁ σκοπὸς τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου – οὐκ ἔξωθεν (The intention of the great Basil – not from without) (276, 32–277, 34)
7. Johannes: *Dicitis, quod intentio Basilii – in prima convenimus* (146, 29–41) / Λέγεις ὅτι ὁ σκοπὸς τοῦ Βασιλείου – πρὸς γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον συμφωνοῦμεν (You say that the intention of Basil – for on the first point we agree) (277, 35–277, 34)
8. Eugenicus: *Cum ego suscepissem expositionem vestram – eiusdem nature et consubstantialis* (147, 1–18) / Ἐγὼ τὴν σὴν ἐξήγησιν παραδεξάμενος – ὡς ὁμοφυῆς αὐτῷ καὶ ὁμοούσιος (I, having accepted your explanation – as of the same nature and consubstantial with him) (277, 35–279, 3)
9. Johannes: *Ea, que dixi in alia congregatione – placet, ut veniatis ad tertium* (147, 20–48) / Ἄ εἶπον ἐν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ συνελεύσει – διὰ τοῦτο ἐλθὲ ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ (What I said in the other assembly – therefore come to the third) (279, 4–21)
10. Eugenicus: *Dixistis – causam esse Spiritus* (147, 35–37) / Εἶπας – αἰτία τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος (You said – the cause of the Holy Spirit) (279, 29–35)
11. Johannes: *Non bene replicas* (147, 38) / Οὐ λέγομεν οὕτως (We do not say thus) (280, 7)
12. Eugenicus: *Quando audimus – intelligere debemus ... causam?* (147, 39–40) / Ὅταν ἀκούσωμεν – νοεῖν ὀφείλομεν ... τὴν αἰτίαν ἐξ ἀνάγκης; (When we hear – must we understand ... the cause necessarily?) (280, 3–10)
13. Johannes: *De necessitate cogimur dicere – exemplum ... nihil facit ad propositum* (148, 1–8) / ἀναγκαίως ἀναγκαζόμεθα νοεῖν – τὸ δὲ παράδειγμα

- οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον (We are necessarily compelled to understand – but the example is not to the point) (280, 13–32)
14. Eugenius: *Ea, que dicta sunt per Beatum Basilium ... dimittenda sunt nunc – a substantia Patris et Filii?* (148, 7–12) / Τὰ μὲν τοῦ Βασιλείου κατὰ τὸ παρόν – ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεώς ἐστιν αὐτῶν; (The things of Basil for the present – is it from their hypostasis?) (280, 39–281, 7)
15. Johannes: *Actiones – verum?* (148, 12) / αἱ ἐνέργειαι – ἀληθές; (The activities – is it true?) (281, 7–7)
16. Johannes: *non est possibile in divinis – persone sunt unum, ubi non est oppositio relativa* (148, 16–21) / ἐπὶ τῶν θείων οὐκ ἔστιν – τὰ πρόσωπα ἓν εἰσιν· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀντίθεσις ἀναφορική (In divine things it is not – the persons are one; for there is no relative opposition) (281, 13–24)
17. Eugenius: *Ego non possum concludere – dicta doctorum* (148, 23–14) / Ἐγὼ οὐ δύναμαι συνάψαι – ἀκολουθῶς τοῖς διδασκάλοις (I cannot connect – according to the doctors) (282, 1–12)
18. Andreas of Rhodes: *Propter equivocationem – primam intelligimus personam (Patris)* (148, 30–34) / τὸ γεννῶν τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν ὁμωνυμία – νοοῦμεν τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς πρόσωπον (What generates the ambiguity is equivocation – we understand the person of the Father) (282, 1–12)
19. Emperor: *Non videtur posse responderi duobus, maxime ad invicem differentibus* (148, 38–39) / Οὐδὲν δύνανται οἱ ἡμέτεροι ἀπολογεῖσθαι τοῖς δυσὶ καὶ ταῦτα μαχομένοις ἀλλήλοις (Our people cannot respond to the two and these contradicting each other) (282, 15–17)
20. Johannes: *Nos dicimus, quod Isaac ut suppositum – ut veritas habeatur* (149, 3–23) / ἐρῶ .. ὥς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ ἐστιν – ἵνα ἐξετάσωμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν (I shall say .. as it is in the case of Isaac – so that we may examine the truth) (282, 10–283, 37)
21. Eugenius: *Collegi ex dictis tuis – causam Spiritus?* (149, 25–29) / Συνήγαγον ἐκ τῶν σῶν λόγων – αἰτία; (I have gathered from your words – cause?) (284, 1–11)
22. Johannes: *ego dixi, quod pro finali habenda veritate – omnes intelligunt* (150, 10–15) / Ἐγὼ εἶπον .. ὅτι ἡ τελευταία ἀνάλυσις – πάντες νοοῦσιν (I said .. that the final analysis – all understand) (285, 13–26)

23. Eugenicus: *Videamus dicta vestra – nec in humanis* (150, 18–28) / ἴδωμεν .. τῶν παρὰ σου εἰρημένων – οὔτε ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων (Let us see .. of what you have said – nor in human things) (286, 7–19)
24. Johannes: *Volo ... hoc ostendendo – textus in greco antiquissimus* (150, 31–151, 7) / Βούλομαι ἀποδείξαι – ἰδὲ ἀρχαιότατον βιβλίον (I wish to demonstrate – behold a most ancient book) (287, 17–288, 7)
25. Eugenicus: *substantia Patris et Filii – nunc ingrediamur ad auctoritatem (Basilii)* (151, 9–18) / οὐσίαν Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ – νῦν οὖν πρὸς τὴν ἐξέτασιν χωρήσωμεν (The substance of Father and Son – let us now proceed to the examination) (287, 17–288, 7)
26. Johannes: *substantia quandoque capitur – sic teneatis intellectum* (151, 34–152, 32) / ἡ οὐσία ἐνίστε λαμβάνεται – τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον κάτεχε (The substance is sometimes taken – hold to this understanding) (288, 12–291, 11)
27. Cesarini: *provincialis respondit quesito tuo* (152, 7) / ὁ προβεντζιάλιος ἀρκούντως διεσάφησε τὸ παρὰ τῆς σῆς αἰδεσιμότητος εἰρημένον (The Provincial sufficiently clarified what was said by your reverence) (291, 14–16)
28. Eugenicus: *Nos cum audimus – Placetne vobis hoc, quod substantia dicatur persona ...?* (152, 16–39) / Ἡμεῖς ὅταν ἀκούσωμεν – ἀρέσκει σοι τοῦτο ὅτι ὑπόστασις ἢ οὐσία καλεῖται, ἢ ...; (When we hear – does it please you that it is called hypostasis or substance, or ...?) (291, 17–24)
29. Johannes: *Audistis – de substantia Patris, ut de principio <per> quod* (152, 40–153, 11) / Ἦκουσας – τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὡς ἐξ ἀρχῆς δι' ἧς (You heard – from the substance of the Father, as from the principle through which) (291, 15–292, 14)
30. Eugenicus: *Dixistis – tribus personis* (153, 19–13) / Εἶπας – τοῖς τρισὶ προσώποις (You said – to the three persons) (292, 16–18)
31. Johannes: *Que est (distinctio), realis vel secundum rationem?* (153, 21) / Τίς ἐστίν, κατ' ἐπίνοιαν ἢ πραγματική; (Which is it, conceptual or real?) (292, 28–29)
32. Eugenicus: *Secundum rationem nostram* (153, 24) / Κατ' ἐπίνοιαν μὲν ἡμετέραν (According to our conception) (292, 7)

33. Johannes: *Proprietates iste sunt idem cum persona ...?* (153, 26) / Ταῦτα τὰ ιδιώματά εἰσι ταὐτά τῷ προσώπῳ; (Are these properties the same as the person?) (293, 1–9)
34. Eugenicus (or Bessarion): *Secundum rem – sed distinguuntur ratione* (153, 29) / Κατὰ τὸ πρᾶγμα – διακρίνονται .. κατὰ τὴν θεωρίαν (In reality – they are distinguished .. according to consideration)
35. Johannes: *cum in Patre – vel utraque?* (153, 29–35) / ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ἐν τῷ Πατρί – ἢ ἐκάτερον; (Since therefore in the Father – or each?) (293, 11–14)
36. Eugenicus: *Id quod communicatur – communis tribus* (153, 36–38) / Τὸ κοινωνούμενον – κοινὴ τῶν τριῶν οὐσα (What is communicated – being common to the three) (293, 15–19)
37. Johannes: *Id quod communicatur – communem essentiam* (153, 39–154, 7) / Τὸ κοινωνούμενον – κοινὴν ταύτην οὐσίαν (What is communicated – this common essence) (293, 20–26)
38. Eugenicus: *Ita, hoc nos diximus – dividitur* (154, 4–5) / Τοῦτο μὲν οὕτως εἶπομεν – μερίζεται (We said this thus – it is divided) (293, 27–29)
39. Johannes: *Id quod ego colligo – secundum rationem distincte* (154, 10–15) / Ἐκ τούτου συνήξα – κατ' ἐπίνοιαν εἶναι διηρημένα (From this I conclude – to be divided according to conception) (294, 3–13)
40. Eugenicus: *Ego non dixi – secundum rationem ad invicem distinguantur* (154, 16–20) / Οὐκ εἶπον – κατ' ἐπίνοιαν διακρίνονται (I did not say – they are distinguished according to conception) (294, 14–21)
41. Johannes: *doctores nostri Latini – secundum essentiam sunt unum, et est unus Deus* (154, 26–27) / οἱ ἡμέτεροι – κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν εἰσὶν ἓν καὶ εἷς θεός (Ours – according to essence are one and one God) (293, 3–5) (294, 3–13)

Collation III (7 or 8 March 1439)

1. Eugenicus: *legatur auctoritas (Basilii) – pietatis tradit sermo* (154, 36–155, 7) / ἀναγνωσθήτω τοίνυν ἡ χρῆσις αὕτη – ὅτῃς εὐσεβείας λόγος (Let this passage be read – the teaching of piety) (295, 20–296, 3)
2. Eugenicus: *Liber iste – intentionem Doctoris* (155, 9–19) / Τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον – πρὸς τὸν σκοπὸν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰρημένων (This book – toward the intention of what was said by him) (294, 7–23)

3. Johannes: *Audivimus duo – quod ita voluerit* (155, 13–156, 22) / Ἠκούσαμεν δύο – ὡς Βασίλειος ἠβουλήθη (We heard two – as Basil wished) (296, 24–299, 34)
4. Eugenicus: *Quod liber iste similis apud nos inveniatur – stare in huiusmodi* (156, 27–157, 15) / Ὅτι μὲν καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν εὐρίσκεται τὸ βιβλίον – κεῖσθαι ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις (That the book is also found among us – to be present in the books) (300, 9–301, 29)
5. Eugenicus: *In hac parte – sic in nostro libro dicit* (158, 18–36) / Ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει – οὕτως, ἐν τῷ παρ' ἡμῖν βιβλίῳ λέγει (In this part – thus, in our book it says) (301, 35–303, 11)
6. Eugenicus: *quod autem hanc opinionem nullo modo habuerit Basilius – productionem Spiritus, que Patri attribuitur soli?* (159, 9–34) / Ὅτι δὲ ταύτην τὴν διάνοιαν οὐκ εἶχεν ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος – οὐκ ἄρα κοινωνεῖ τῇ ἐκπορεύσει τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἥτις ἰδίως τῷ Πατρί μόνῳ ἀποδέδοται; (But that the great Basil had this opinion in no way – therefore it does not share in the procession of the Holy Spirit, which is properly attributed to the Father alone?) (303, 32–305, 11)
7. Johannes: *Multa dicta sunt per rev. patrem – quod (Filius) pendet a Patre* (159, 35–161, 10) / Πολλά εἰρηγνται παρὰ σου – καθὼς λέγει· ὁ Υἱὸς ἐξήρηται τοῦ Πατρός (Many things have been said by you – as he says: the Son depends on the Father) (305, 19–308, 31)
8. Johannes: *Quomodo vocatur ille liber?* (161, 2) / Ποῖόν ἐστι τὸ βιβλίον; (What is the book?) (309, 10)
9. Eugenicus: *Liber canonum* (161, 9) / Τὸ βιβλίον τῶν κανόνων τῶν συνόδων (The book of the canons of the synods) (309, 11–12)
10. Johannes: *Nunquam reperietur – fecerit fallaciam* (161, 25) / Οὐδέποτε εὐρεθήσεται – πεποιηκέναι τὴν φθορὰν ταύτην (It shall never be found – to have made this corruption) (309, 13–15)
11. Eugenicus: *Ea, que connumerantur – ubi invenistis ... ab eo habeat esse?* (161, 31–35) / Τὰ συναριθμούμενα – πόθεν νοεῖς .. ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔχει; (The things enumerated together – from where do you understand .. it has the cause from him?) (309, 23–34)
12. Johannes: *Nil aliud est nisi ordo – secluso nomine, non est aliquis ordo Spiritus ad Filium?* (162, 7–6) / ἡ τάξις αὕτη οὐδὲν ἐστίν – ὑπεξαίρομένης

- τῆς φωνῆς ... οὐδεμία θεωρεῖται τάξις; (This order is nothing – with the word removed ... no order is observed?) (310, 14–18)
13. Eugenius: *Est quidem necessitas – alium ordinem a theologis non habemus* (162, 7–13) / Ἔστι μὲν ἀνάγκη – ἄλλην δὲ παρὰ τῶν θεολόγων οὐδεμίαν λαβόντες ἔχομεν (There is indeed necessity – but another from the theologians we do not have having received) (310, 19–34)
14. Johannes: *Dicitis ex intentione Basilii – in eadem natura intellectuali* (162, 14–39) / Λέγεις ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ σκοποῦ τοῦ θεοῦ Βασιλείου – ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ νοερῇ φύσει (You say that from the intention of the divine Basil – in that same intellectual nature) (310, 35–312, 9)
15. Eugenius: *Est quidem naturalis ordo – per suppositionem hoc ponit* (162, 36–163, 7) / Ἔστι μὲν φυσικὴ τάξις – καθ' ὑπόθεσιν (There is indeed a natural order – by supposition) (312, 21–313, 10)
16. Johannes: *quia ostendimus ex hoc libro – volo dicere imperatori, ut me percipiat* (163, 10–19) / ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἀπεδείξαμεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας βίβλου – βούλομαι εἰπεῖν ὥστε ἀκοῦσαι καὶ τὸν γαληνότατον βασιλέα (Because we have demonstrated from our book – I wish to speak so that the most serene emperor may also hear) (313, 16–30)
17. Johannes: *Doctores nostri theologi – hic est punctus rei nostre* (163, 15–30) / πάντες οἱ διδάσκαλοι καὶ θεολόγοι – ἡ ἀκμὴ τῆς ὑποθέσεως (All the teachers and theologians – the crux of the matter) (313, 31–314, 27)
18. Eugenius: *Antequam ... consideremus – dignitate tertium?* (163, 31–33) / Πρὸ τοῦ διαλαβεῖν ... ἐξετάσωμεν – τὸ τρίτον εἶναι τῇ τάξει (Before we examine – to be third in order) (314, 28–32)
19. Johannes: *Ita – textus* (163, 34) / Ναί, οὕτως ἐστὶ (Yes, it is thus) (314, 34)
20. Eugenius: *Dicebatne idem?* (163, 35) / Αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο; (This very thing?) (315, 7)
21. Johannes: *Ita – natura* (163, 36–38) / Οὕτως – τῇ φύσει (Thus – in nature) (315, 4–19)
22. Eugenius: *Veritatem – dignitate tertium* (164, 1) / Ἠλήθευεν – τρίτον .. τῷ ἀξιῳματι (It was true – third .. in dignity) (315, 13–14)
23. Johannes: *Ita* (164, 2) / (315, 16)
24. Eugenius: *Similiter – doctrinam* (164, 3) / συνεφώνει – ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ (He agreed – his doctrine) (315, 17–18)

25. Eugenicus: *Non dicit liber vester – simulat* / Προσποιεῖται – οὐ λέγει τοῦτο τὸ σὸν βιβλίον; (He pretends – does your book not say this?) (315, 24–27)
26. Johannes: *Ita, quia simulabat – tertius natura* (164, 31) / Προσποιεῖται – τρίτον τῇ τάξει (He pretends – third in order) (315, 24–27)
27. Eugenicus: *Basilus non dicit – ordine* (164, 12–13) / οὐ λέγει οὕτω – τὴν τάξιν (He does not say thus – the order) (315, 29–32)
28. Johannes: *Illa simulatio – colligitur* (164, 14–19) / Ἡ προσποίησις – ἀναφέρεται (The pretense – is referred) (315, 33)
29. Eugenicus: *Si opinio sanctorum – nonne habet liber?* (164, 20) / Εἰ δόξα τῶν ἁγίων – οὐκ ἔχει ταῦτα .. βιβλίον; (If the opinion of the saints – does the book not have these things?) (316, 11–317, 19)
30. Johannes: *Ego adduco testimonium ... Athanasii – ostendetur ex Basiliomet* (163, 39) / προφέρω σοι μαρτυρίαν .. Ἀθανάσιον – ἀποδείξομεν .. ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Βασιλείου (I bring you testimony .. Athanasius – we shall demonstrate .. from Basil himself) (317, 19–318, 20)

Collation IV (10 March 1439)

1. Eugenicus: *In precedenti congregatione – a Filio Spiritum habere esse* (165, 25–167, 2) / Ἐν τῇ προλαβούσῃ συνελεύσει – ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ εἶναι ἔχειν τὸ Πνεῦμα (In the preceding assembly – the Spirit having its being from the Son) (318, 9–323, 35)
2. Johannes: *Iste modus investigandi veritatem – quod accipit esse (a Filio); estne verum?* (167, 35–168, 7) / Ὁ τρόπος οὗτος .. τοῦ ἀνιχνεύειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν – λαμβάνειν τὸ εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ· ἔστιν οὖν ληθές; (This manner of investigating the truth – to receive being from the Son: is it therefore true ...?) (324, 3–325, 7)
3. Eugenicus: *Ita dixi – scriptura hoc dicit* (168, 12–28) / Οὕτως εἶπον – ἐν τῷ ῥητῷ τούτῳ (Thus I said – in this passage) (325, 9–10)
4. Johannes: *Ex hac audientia – legerunt in illo libro* (168, 12–28) / ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ῥήσεως – τὸ βιβλίον ἐκεῖνο (From this statement – that book) (325, 19–326, 19)
5. Andreas: *Hoc medio portatus est liber, qui erat archiepiscopi Mitilenensis* (168, 29) / Καὶ προηνέχθη βιβλίον τοῦ Μιτυλήνης (And a book of the Archbishop of Mytilene was brought forth) (326, 20)

6. Eugenicus: *Iste liber noster – ut liber vester* (168, 31) / τὸ προκομισθὲν βιβλίον – τὸ ἕτερον (The book brought forward – the other) (326, 21–22)
7. Johannes: *quoad primum punctum – illud esse, quod causat in creaturis* (169, 7–7) / Πρὸς μὲν οὖν τὸ πρῶτον – τὸ λαμβάνειν τὸ εἶναι γίνεται αἰτία τῶν κτιστῶν (As for the first point – the receiving of being becomes the cause of creatures) (326, 23–328, 25)
8. Johannes: *Nunc venio ad secundum – vester (liber) dicit: secundus* (170, 2–7) / Ἰωμεν οὖν ἐπὶ τὸ δεύτερον μέρος – τὸ δὲ ὑμέτερον. Δεύτερον (Let us go to the second part – and yours. Second) (328, 11–329, 15)
9. Eugenicus: *que est necessitas – natura?* (170, 9–10) / Τίς γὰρ ἀνάγκη – φύσει αὐτό; (For what necessity – in nature?) (329, 17–18)
10. Johannes: *Sequitur in nostro: dignitate – noster (liber) dicit* (170, 11–26) / ἔπεται οὕτω τὸ ἡμέτερον κείμενον – τὸ δὲ ἡμέτερον λέγει (Our text thus follows – and ours says) (329, 19–330, 24)
11. Johannes: *Legatis ibi ... quod sicut Filius – quia deitas in utroque una* (170, 20–31) / τὸ δὲ ἡμέτερον λέγει ... ὥς μὲν γὰρ ὁ Υἱός – ἐπειδὴ ἐν ἑκατέρῳ ἡ θεότης μία (And ours says ... for as the Son – since in each the divinity is one) (330, 23–29)
12. Johannes: *Venio ad primum, cum dicit: fortassis – illud principium est, quo communicatur* (170, 33–173, 31) / Ἐν μὲν οὖν τῷ πρώτῳ – ἀρχὴ ἡ μεταδιδομένη (In the first therefore – the principle that is communicated) (330, 30–338, 16)
13. Eugenicus: *Non dicit – ordinem a natura* (173, 32) / οὐκ ἔστι ταὐτὸν τὸ λέγειν – τάξιν φύσεως (It is not the same thing to say – an order of nature) (338, 17–19)
14. Johannes: *Ego dico – respondebo* (173, 33–38) / Λέγω – ἀποκριθήσομαι (I say – I shall respond) (338, 20–20)
15. Emperor: *Scitis – nescimus unde incipere, et dies non sufficeret* (173, 39–40) / Ὑμεῖς οἴδατε – ὅσα οὐ δυνήσονται οἱ ἡμέτεροι ἀπολογήσασθαι ἕως ἑσπέρας (You know – what ours will not be able to answer until evening) (338, 31–339, 2)

Collation V (14 March 1439)

1. Eugenicus: *Si volemus – quia eam (auctoritatem) altera <vice?> non exposui* (174, 6–11) / Ἐὰν θελήσωμεν – ἐπειδήπερ οὐκ ἐξεθέμεθα τοῦτο (If we wish – since we have not set this forth) (339, 9–19)
2. Johannes: *Ut ordo servetur – auctoritatem Basilii* (174, 14–13) / κατὰ τὴν τάξιν – πρότερον τὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Βασιλείου (According to the order – first that of St. Basil) (339, 21–26)
3. Eugenicus: *In precedenti congregatione – veniemus ad auctoritatem Basilii* (174, 14–16) / ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ συνελεύσει – πρὸς τὸ τοῦ Βασιλείου χωρήσομεν (In the former assembly – we shall proceed to that of Basil) (339, 25–20)
4. Johannes: *Si non est ordo – sequimini ordinem illum* (174, 17–27) / μὴ οὔσης τάξεως – τὴν τάξιν τηρήσωμεν τῆς διαλέξεως (There being no order – let us observe the order of the discussion) (339, 29–340, 29)
5. Eugenicus: *Ego volebam – Basilii sententiam esse* (174, 29–175, 9) / Ἐγὼ μὲν ἐβουλόμην – γνώμην τοῦ ἁγίου Βασιλείου (I indeed wished – the opinion of St. Basil) (339, 31–342)
6. Andreas: *Surrexit quidam grecus et legit – (Spiritus sanctus) non est nominatus Filius* (175, 7–9) / Καὶ ἀνεγνώσθη τὸ ῥητὸν τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου – οὐδὲ ὀνομάζεται (Υἱός) (And the passage of the great Basil was read – nor is it named (Son)) (341, 27–32)
7. Eugenicus: *In hac (auctoritate) nullo modo iacet – hoc nullo modo* (175, 13–33) / Ἐν τούτοις οὐ μόνον οὐ κεῖται – τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδαμῶς (In these things not only is it not present – for this in no way) (342, 1–343, 15)
8. Johannes: *Et fecistis longam orationem – a Filio Spiritus* (175, 35–176, 7) / Μακρὰν ἐποιήσω ὁμιλίαν – τὸ Πνεῦμα παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ (You made a long discourse – the Spirit from the Son) (343, 17–38)
9. Johannes: *sicut si diceremus: non enim accipio aliqua ab imperatore – sequitur, quod Spiritus est casus nominativi* (176, 6) / Καὶ παραδείγματος χάριν· οὐδὲ γὰρ λαμβάνει τις παρὰ τοῦ γαληνοτάτου κυρίου τοῦ βασιλέως – ἀναγκαίως δεῖ εἶναι εὐθεΐαν τὸ Πνεῦμα (And by way of example: for no one receives from the most serene lord the emperor – necessarily the Spirit must be in the nominative) (344, 1–8)
10. Eugenicus: *Hoc ita esset – a Filio* (176, 10) / Τοῦτο εἶχεν ἂν οὕτως – παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ (This would be so – from the Son) (344, 10–19)

11. Johannes: *Quero, anne dona – dentur cum Spiritu sancto* (176, 27) / ἐρωτῶ σε πότερον τὰ χαρίσματα – δίδονται μετὰ τοῦ .. Πνεύματος (I ask you whether the gifts – are given with the .. Spirit) (346, 2–4)
12. Emperor: *Dicimus extra propositam auctoritatem* (176, 29) / Ταῦτα οὐ ποιοῦσι πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον (These things are not to the point) (346, 15–16)
13. Eugenius: *Auctoritas ista – veniemus ad alia* (177, 18–20) / Τὸ ῥητὸν τοῦτο – ἐφ' ἑτερον μεταβῶμεν (This passage – let us pass to another) (346, 23–34)
14. Johannes: *Beatus Cyrillus – vera sententia auctoritatis illius* (177, 31–38) / Ὁ μακάριος Κύριλλος – ταύτης εἶναι τῆς χρήσεως τὴν ἐξήγησιν (Blessed Cyril – to be the explanation of this passage) (346, 35–348, 11)
15. Eugenius: *Nos dicimus, quod possumus salvare vestram expositionem – nos autem a Spiritu* (177, 46–178, 10) / Ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὅτι δύναται σῶζεσθαι καὶ ἡ ὑμετέρα ἐξήγησις – ἡμεῖς δὲ παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος (We say that your explanation can also be preserved – but we from the Spirit) (348, 12–38)

Collation VI (17 March 1439)

1. Eugenius: *Fides nostra – quia de proximo de illo egerunt memoriam* (184, 9–187, 9) / Ἡ ἡμετέρα πίστις – ἐπειδὴ προσεχῶς αὐτοῦ ἐπεμνήσθησαν (Our faith – since they mentioned him immediately) (364, 7–369, 36)
2. Johannes: *In precedenti nostra disputatione – ita debent duci testimonia, ut investigemus intentiones sanctorum* (188, 10–188) / Ἐν τῇ προλαβούσῃ διαλέξει – οὕτω γὰρ ὀφείλουσι τίθεσθαι αἱ μαρτυρίαι καὶ τὰ ῥητὰ ὥστε ἡμᾶς .. ἀνιχνεύειν καὶ ἐρευνᾶν τὰς μαρτυρίας τῶν ἁγίων (In the preceding discussion – for thus the testimonies and passages must be set forth so that we .. may trace and search the testimonies of the saints) (370, 7–373, 7)
3. Eugenius: *Nos modum disputationis – tempus paciatur* (188, 7–20) / Ἡμεῖς τὸν τρόπον τῆς διαλέξεως – ὁ καιρὸς συγχωρῇ (We the manner of the discussion – as time permits) (373, 6–32)
4. Emperor: *vos dicebatis – non poterimus dicere* (188, 24–25) / ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ἡμεῖς δὲ καιρὸν οὐχ εὐρίσκομεν (You say, but we do not find the time) (373, 35–36)
5. Eugenius: *Redeamus ad consequentiam eorum, que dicebamus – procedere etiam a Filio* (188, 39–189, 11) / Πρὸς τὴν ἀκολουθίαν ἐκείνην

ἐπανέλθωμεν τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν λεγομένων – καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγοντι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι (Let us return to the sequence of what we were saying – and those saying the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son) (374, 1–31)

6. Eugenicus: *his Patribus magnus Basilius inquit consonum – ego cum Patre novi Spiritum, sed non Patrem, Spiritum* / Τούτοις τοῖς πατράσι καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασίλειός φησι σύμφωνα – ἐγὼ μετὰ Πατρός μὲν οἶδα, οὐχὶ δὲ Πατέρα τὸ Πνεῦμα (With these Fathers the great Basil also says concordant things – I know together with the Father, but not the Father as the Spirit) (374, 32–375, 10)

SANTACROCE (ed. Hofmann) / ACTA (ed. Gill)

7. Eugenicus: *Ego cum Patre quidem scio Spiritum, ... et cum Filio accepi – in secula seculorum.* (189, 39–192, 22) / Ἐγὼ μετὰ Πατρός μὲν οἶδα οὐχὶ δὲ Πατέρα τὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ μετὰ Υἱοῦ παρέλαβον – σέκουλα σεκουλόρουμ. Ἀμήν. (I indeed know the Spirit together with the Father, but not the Father as the Spirit; and together with the Son I received – saecula saeculorum. Amen.) (375, 7–382, 2)
8. Cesarini: *Restat – ut respondeat argumentis* (192) / Δικαίον ἐστὶν – ἵνα ἀπολογηθῇς καὶ εἰς τὰ τελευταῖα (It is right – that you respond also to the last things) (382, 27–28)
9. Eugenicus: *Quoniam nos putamus ostendisse – nec habemus nec volumus* (192, 25–33) / Ἡμεῖς διότι ἱκανῶς ἀπεδείξαμεν – οὔτε ἔχομεν οὔτε βουλόμεθα (Since we sufficiently demonstrated – we neither have nor wish) (383, 1–23) (386, 16–387, 29)
10. Johannes: *Quia dominus Ephesus in fine dicit – voluntati imperatoris, qui dicit, quod debet respondere* (192, 34–38) / Ἐπειδὴ, κύριε Ἐφέσου, περὶ τὸ τέλος εἶπες – τῷ θελήματι τοῦ γαληνοτάτου κυρίου τοῦ βασιλέως εἰρηκότος σε ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀπολογησόμενον (Since, Lord of Ephesus, you said toward the end – to the will of the most serene lord the emperor who said you would respond to all things) (383, 23–29)
11. Johannes: *Omnibus dictis per eum de capitulo – sequitur absolute conclusio* (192, 39–193, 9) / αὐτὸς ἱκανοποιήσω πᾶσι τοῖς παρά σου εἰρημένοις – τὸ ἀκόλουθον ὀφείλει εἶναι χωρὶς τῆς οἰασοῦν ἀμφιβολίας (I myself shall

satisfy all the things said by you – the conclusion must be without any ambiguity whatsoever) (383, 35–384, 32)

12. Eugenius: *Quod libri producti a vobis – ego diligentissimam certificationem habeo* (193, 24–14) / Τὸ τὰς βίβλους ἀμφιβόλους εἶναι τὰς προενεχθείσας παρ' ἡμῶν – ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀκριβῆ πληροφορίαν ἔχω (That the books produced by us are doubtful – for I have precise certainty) (386, 3–9)
13. Eugenius: *de hoc certus sum, cum sciam in civitate Constantinopolitana ultra mille – nostris* (193, 28–29) / γινώσκων ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει ὑπὲρ χίλια – ὃν ἡμεῖς εἶπομεν (knowing that in Constantinople more than a thousand – of which we spoke) (386, 11–13)
14. Eugenius: *Ad argumentum ita dico: non est mirandum – ergo non est mirandum, si per ea, que dicta sunt, ostendimus* (193, 33–194, 11) / Πρὸς δὲ παρά σου εἰρημένα λέγω ὅτι θαυμαστὸν οὐδέν – διὰ τοῦτο καὶ θαυμαστὸν οὐδέν εἰ διὰ τῶν ὁμολογουμένων αὐτὰ ἀποδείκνυμεν (To what was said by you I say that there is nothing surprising – therefore it is also nothing surprising if through the things admitted we demonstrate them) (386, 16–387, 29)

From the comparison between the text of Andreas de Sancta Cruce and the Greek Acts I was able to establish very frequent verbal or near-verbal concordances pertaining to the public sessions of the Council of Florence. The question therefore arises about the cause of these concordances. The Greek Acts, insofar as they are preserved and now edited by my colleague Father Joseph Gill, owe their origin to the Greek notaries, who also had the opportunity — and made use of it — of consulting the work of the Latin notaries of the Council of Florence, one of whom was certainly Andreas de Sancta Cruce, the consistorial advocate. The original redactions of the notaries are, alas, now lost — with the exception of one Latin document on the declaration concerning the words of eucharistic consecration; but there still exist, something that was previously less known to writers on the Council of Florence, codices very close in time to the Council of Florence, from which the greater part of the protocol of the notaries could be edited. As regards the Greek text, Gill has provided this, whose prolegomena in the first fascicle of his edition soberly and solidly demonstrate that the work called *Praktika* consists of Acts and a Description and some other documents; that in the Acts is contained the protocol of the Greek notaries on the public sessions of the Council of Florence

from 8 October 1438 to 17 March 1439; that in the Description are found above all those things narrated about the reception of the Greeks at Venice, Ferrara, and Florence; those things pertaining to the first common session of 9 April 1438 at Ferrara; the discussions on Purgatory (in the months of June and July 1438); and the deliberations of the Greeks among themselves before and after the death of the Patriarch of Constantinople Joseph II (died 10 June 1439) on reaching agreement with the Latins. Several documents — the dogmatic speech of Bessarion on the Union addressed to the Greeks themselves, and the speeches of Georgios Scholarios to the Greeks on concluding peace with the Latins, and the various formulas of the Greeks which the Latins proposed until the text of the bull of Union was concordantly drafted and accepted by Latins and Greeks — belong to the second source of the *Praktika* work itself, namely the so-called Description, which certainly has historical value.

If the Latin documents are now considered, it can be said that we still have the protocol of the Latin notaries on the sessions of the Council of Florence before the arrival of the Greeks — and indeed in complete form; furthermore a posthumous protocol of 27 August 1439 on the conciliar session of 5 July 1439.

If anyone carefully considers my tables on the verbal or near-verbal concordance between Santacroce and the Greek Acts, and the texts in the Latin edition of Andreas de Santacroce and in the Greek edition of the Acts, he can easily arrive at the conclusion that in the Latin accounts of the advocate Andreas de Santacroce there is contained a great part of the protocol of the Latin notaries, or at least what most excellently supplements the Latin protocol.

That Santacroce does not contain a simple version of the Greek protocol is proven by the following reasons:

1. In the protocol there are absent not a few things that were recited in Latin by the Latin orators and immediately translated by the interpreter into Greek according to the practice then in force during the sessions of the council. Thus there are absent, for example, the second speech of Ludovico of Pirano, O.F.M., Bishop of Forlì; the two speeches of Johannes de Montenegro, O.P., in the two sessions of 21 and 24 March 1439; the two

speeches of the same author on the Primacy; and the two speeches of Johannes de Torquemada, O.P., on the Most Holy Eucharist.

2. The Latin texts of the Latin orators are presented by Andreas de Santacroce in the original language (not from a translation of a Greek version); this is proven already from the fact that for some Latin speeches we also have another path of preservation, by which the Latin text of Andreas de Santacroce is also found conformable — even in individual Latin phrases — to another text (not a mere copy of Andreas de Sancta Cruce) that is independent: the speech of Giuliano Cesarini on Purgatory of 4 June 1438; and the speech of Johannes, Abbot of Clairvaux, legate of Philip, Duke of Burgundy, of 27 November 1438.
3. Citations from St. Thomas Aquinas made by the Latin orators are often given word for word or nearly word for word; the same holds for citations of the Latin Fathers, of papal letters, if these documents are reproduced not summarily but in full.
4. Indeed the Latin orators make use on several occasions of ancient Latin versions of councils or other ecclesiastical documents originally composed in Greek; this holds for the versions above all of the Council of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and for the Latin version of the work of Manuel Kalekas, O.P., already translated from Greek into Latin by Ambrogio Traversari under Martin V.
5. Since the work of Andreas on the union of the Greeks was already composed between 6 July 1439 and 22 November 1439 — on which day the union of the Armenians was concluded, with which the last pages of the principal codex deal — and since this codex presents the character of a copyist or hurrying writer, with the autograph note of Andreas regarding the empty spaces: *nihil deest* (nothing is missing), it seems that the conclusion must be drawn as to the independence of the author not only from the totality of the *Praktika* work but also from its principal source, namely the Greek Acts. I perhaps make a better and more precise judgment if I say that the Greek Acts themselves, insofar as they still exist, and the foundation of the accounts of Andreas de Sancta Cruce have a common origin — namely the protocols of the Greek and Latin notaries.

VIII. CONCORDANCES BETWEEN SANTACROCE AND OTHER DOCUMENTS OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE (BESIDES THE GREEK ACTS)

In order to exhaust the entire question of the verbal or near-verbal concordance of Andreas de Sancta Cruce with the documents of the Council of Florence, I wish to add here an inquiry: 1. on the verbal concordance between Santacroce and the Greek Description (understood in the sense of the editor as distinct from the Greek Acts); 2. on the verbal concordance between Santacroce and Silvester Syropoulos, author of the *Memoirs* of the Council of Florence in the Greek language; 3. between the papal bulls according to Santacroce and other examples, whether originals or authentic copies. To announce the final conclusion already: I say that there are very few concordances as regards points 1 and 2, and as regards point 3 we have four full texts of papal bulls in Santacroce.

1. Concordances between Santacroce and the Greek Description

SANTACROCE (ed. Hofmann) / DESCRIPTIO GRAECA (ed. Gill)

a) Speech of Bessarion (8 or 9 Oct. 1438): *maximarum rerum – in secula seculorum. Amen* (34, 7–38, 7) / Τῶν μεγάλων πραγμάτων – εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν (Of the great matters – unto the ages of ages. Amen) (37, 7–46, 29)

b) Speech of Eugenius (13 Dec. 1438): *Nam symbolum – in secula seculorum. Amen* (124, 1–18) / Τοῦτο τὸ σύμβολον – εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν (This creed – unto the ages of ages. Amen) (216, 1–217, 7)

c) Session of 21 March 1439:

α) Emperor: *nos et nostri non sumus parati – et non respondebitur* (196, 3–35) / Ἡμεῖς κατὰ τὸ παρὸν τίποτε οὐ βουλόμεθα εἰπεῖν – ἡμεῖς οὐδεμίαν ἀπολογίαν θέλομεν ποιήσῃν ὑμῖν (We at present wish to say nothing – we do not wish to make any response to you) (394, 7–9)

β) Johannes de Montenegro: *Reperimus in sacris scripturis – Paraclitus, quem mittet Pater in nomine meo* (197, 39–40) / Φησί γὰρ ἐν εὐαγγελίοις – ἐξ ἐκείνου

ἐστὶ τὸ πεμπόμενον (Πνεῦμα) (For he says in the gospels – from him is the one sent, the Spirit) (394, 26–32)

d) Session of 24 March 1439:

α) Isidore, metropolitan of Kiev: *Quoniam rev. pater multa dicit ... ac amplificando potius – diligenter considerabimus* (222, 1–12) / διό και ἡ σὴ σεβασμιότης πολλὰ μὲν ἐθεολόγησας καὶ λαμπρῶς ἐρρητόρευσας – ποιήσομεν τὴν ἀπόκρισιν (Therefore your reverence has theologized much and spoken splendidly – we shall make the response) (398, 17–22)

β) Cesarini: *Quantum ad exhibitionem scripturarum, vestri scriptores scripserunt et nostri – sumus contenti, ut nostri scriptores et vestri convenient in sancto Francisco* (222, 17–31) / Ὅσα εἶπαμεν, οἱ νοτάριοι ἐσχεδιάζον – ἔλθετε εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ ἁγίου Φραγκίσκου (What we said, the notaries were writing – come to the church of St. Francis) (398, 28–31)

γ) Profession of the Greeks on 4 June 1439: *profitemur quod Spiritus sanctus ex Patre et Filio eternaliter est, et ex utroque eternaliter tanquam ab uno principio et unica spiratione procedit* (224, 25–26) / λέγομεν ὅτι ἐκπορεύεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ, ὡς ἀπὸ μιᾶς ἀρχῆς καὶ αἰτίας (We say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, as from one principle and cause) (415, 10–19)

2. Concordances between Santacroce and Syropoulos

SANTACROCE (ed. Hofmann) / SYROPOULOS (ed. Creighton)

a) Agreement of the Greeks and Latins on the Procession of the Holy Spirit (before 10 June 1439): *Quoniam in hoc sacro oecumenico concilio – eternaliter genitus est* (224, 6–52) / Ἐπειδὴ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἱερᾷ καὶ οἰκουμενικῇ συνόδῳ – ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἰδίως γεγένηται (Since in this holy and ecumenical synod – from whom he has also been personally begotten) (pp. 236–237)

b) Declaration of the Greeks on the words of consecration of the Most Holy Eucharist: *Verba dominica esse, que mutant et transubstantiant panem in corpus Christi et vinum in sanguinem* / ὅτι αἱ θεῖαι καὶ δεσποτικαὶ φωναὶ εἰσιν αἱ

ἀγιάζουσαι καὶ τελειοῦσαι τὰ θεῖα δῶρα, ἡγουν τό· λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. καὶ τὸ πῖετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου (That the divine and dominical words are those which sanctify and perfect the divine gifts, namely: Take, eat, this is my body; and drink of it, all of you, this is my blood) (p. 293)

3. Concordances between the Papal Bulls in Santacroce and other Exemplars

SANTACROCE (ed. Hofmann) / PAPAL BULLS (ed. Hofmann)

a) Session of 9 April 1438: *Magnas omnipotenti Deo gratias* (31, 10–32, 7) / *Epistolae pontificiae*, **II**, n. 135, pp. 21–23

b) Session of 10 January 1439: *Decet ecumenici concilii* (132, 11–133, 14) / *Epistolae pontificiae*, **II**, n. 160, pp. 60–61

γ) Session of 6 July 1439 (union of the Greeks) (260, 7–266, 12) / *Epistolae pontificiae*, **II**, n. 176, pp. 68–79

δ) Session of 22 November 1439 (union of the Armenians) (269) / *Epistolae pontificiae*, **II**, n. 224, pp. 124–138

IX. ON THE METHOD OF EDITING ADOPTED

The supreme principle in preparing this edition was for me to follow most faithfully the principal manuscript V = Vaticanus latinus 4119, and at the same time to provide for the practical convenience not only of historians but also of theologians. Therefore:

1. Every addition to the text made by me — even the smallest — I have indicated with the customary sign of pointed brackets < >, always however with a note added below, if it is a matter of an omission already understood as such by the author through an empty space.
2. The alteration of words or letters of the codex introduced by me for the purpose of necessary emendation I have expressed with the sign of square brackets [], always in this case with the word of the codex indicated in a note. In cases where the author writes correctly elsewhere, I have simply made the correction; likewise in cases of confusion of *c* with *t* and vice

versa, and in evident cases of distraction on the part of the scribe — but I have noted the reading of the codex below.

3. Punctuation marks, the distinction and use of upper- or lower-case letters, and the division of chapters — whether marked by number or simply by beginning a new line in the text — frequently originate from me, since in these matters negligence and confusion or other lack of clarity are not infrequently present in the codex.
4. The very frequent abbreviations of the author I have simply resolved; in cases of doubtful reading I have placed a note below. However, abbreviations of proper names indicated by a single letter, when supplied by me, I have written with the letters placed in parentheses (), for example (Georgius). To abbreviations must also be counted those frequent cases in which the scribe omitted the sign (a small line, etc.) of abbreviation; but in these cases I have noted the omissions in the critical apparatus.
5. I have generally retained the orthography. Thus proper names — even if often corrupted, provided they are at least still recognizable — I have written as they stand in the codex, but in the notes I have given the correct name, saying first *lege* (read). I have freed the critical apparatus from the multitude of orthographic errors regarding the doubling or simplification of consonants. Examples for cases of erroneous doubling of consonants: *neccessarium, neccessitas, requirrunt, ellectio, oppinionibus, dessignat, ressiduum, oville, pilleum, camellorum, oportet, volluisse, appocalypse, assummo, summitur, vellamine, elligunt, rellatio*. Examples for cases of erroneous simplification of consonants: *comissa, cesavit, facilime, suppressum, erasse, erores, iminere, saluberimus, asurexerunt, policetur, suplicando, inflamati, silogismus, nonnulli, attraxerant*. In these and similar cases I have simply corrected the orthographic errors in the edition itself, without explicitly indicating the erroneous forms in the notes.

In the remaining cases, however, I have always noted the erroneous forms of the codex in the notes, while in the edition of the text itself I have placed the correct orthographic forms. In this way the writer is made more manifest to the reader as regards his nationality or the region of his origin; the reader furthermore has more easily the means for judging the correctness or fidelity of the edition; and finally, now that the orthographic errors of doubling or simplification of consonants have

been eliminated from the critical apparatus, the latter is rendered more perspicuous, since the other orthographic errors are not as frequent as the two series mentioned above.

6. To verify the very frequent citations of Andreas de Sancta Cruce and of the orators of the council I have devoted strenuous effort — something I had already done in my commentaries written on the Council of Florence. I have marked citations with the signs ' (at the beginning) and ' (at the end), if the citations are given word for word or nearly word for word; if within the citation of, for example, a certain Father there is included a citation from Sacred Scripture, I have indicated this in italic type; I have used this same method when there is a repetition of a certain word or phrase in the explanation, or in the use of a full citation given immediately before the explanation.

It remains for me to give thanks to my superiors, and to my confreres Emmanuel Candal, Joseph Gill, Arthur Schönegger, and Johannes Rezac, who rendered me charity with counsel and assistance.

Rome, 2 February 1955.

G. Hofmann, S.J.

DEDICATION OF THE WORK

TO THE MOST SERENE CAESAR, EVER AUGUSTUS ALBERT, KING OF THE ROMANS.

A DIALOGUE OF ANDREA DE SANCTA CRUCE OF ROME, ADVOCATE OF THE APOSTOLIC CONSISTORY, AGAINST LUDOVICO PONTANO THE ROMAN, CONCERNING THE PRIMACY OF THE CHURCH AND THE ACTS OF THE LATIN AND GREEK FATHERS AT THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF FERRARA, FINALLY TRANSLATED TO FLORENCE, LEGITIMATELY CONVENED IN THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Most glorious Caesar and most victorious King of the Romans, ever Augustus, the very great reverence with which those who preceded you in your empire pursued the most holy seat of the apostolic, catholic, Roman Church, and the prelate of that same seat — whom they call the fount of the priesthood, the head and mistress of the churches, and the nurturer of the empire — is attested most copiously by the decrees of your predecessors. Now the prelate himself, desiring to gather new sons, going before your majesty, has restored with his own shoulders to the fold the Eastern Church — separated from the unity of the Roman Church, the mother of so many thousands of souls — having sought no assistance from the imperial height or from the other princes of Christians. Wherefore a great path has been opened toward your glory and the expansion of the Roman Empire; for the most powerful preparation for subjugating peoples is agreement in religion, especially so that those differing in religion may be turned aside from their differences.

So that it may be clear to your majesty how maturely this matter was conducted with counsel, and so that it may provide a firmer resolve for accomplishing the remaining tasks, I, the most devoted and faithful servant of your majesty, Andrea de Sancta Cruce of Rome — though unworthy advocate of the apostolic consistory and of your majesty in the Roman Curia — have set everything down in writing, departing in nothing from the truth of the matter, deliberately omitting ornament of words, and recording the words as they were spoken, lest I diverge in any way from the truth of the facts.

However, because certain persons, in order to divert this most holy work of union of the Eastern Church — which depends upon the authority of the Roman See — called the authority of the aforesaid See into question, I have prefaced a few things concerning the power of that See drawn from the divine scriptures, from the oracles of the saints, from the dogmas of the councils, from the decrees of the pontiffs, and from the most sacred laws of your predecessors, all approved for a long time by the common consent of the faithful — so that your majesty may the more ardently strive to protect the honor, dignity, primacy, and unity of the aforesaid See, from which the dignities of your empire spring, whose advocate, protector, defender, and champion you are — both for the perpetuity of so most holy a work, for the defense of truth, and as a return gift for the benefits received by your predecessors. And so that this matter might be set forth more agreeably

and more fully, I have drawn a close friend of mine, who adheres to the Basellers, into mutual dialogue, so that by complying with his questions I might more fully satisfy the minds of readers.

May your accustomed clemency receive the good faith of the one speaking, submitting all things to the judgment of your majesty, whom the Lord preserve for the vows of His Christian Church. Amen.

[Marginal and editorial notes from the manuscript:]

16: *conventio* V. — ii presul, scilicet Eugenius IV papa. — Vat. lat. 4119, fols. 1r–1v. — 5: *legitime* V.

DIALOGUE CONCERNING THE PRIMACY, OR CONCERNING THE LEGITIMACY OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

DIALOGUE OF LORD ANDREA DE SANCTA CRUCE OF ROME,
ADVOCATE OF THE CONSISTORY, AND LORD LUDOVICO THE
PROTONOTARY.

I. ANDREAS. We have taken no occasion, dearest brother, to communicate with one another in turn, a long absence having caused silence between us, and I was reluctant to challenge by letter your eminent knowledge of sacred doctrines. Yet I could by no means persuade myself that you were thinking rightly, since you believed those gathered at Basel to already represent the universal Church — and I judged you all the more detestably for this, in that you lent them the support of your assent when they impudently assumed the power of the keys. But so that I may receive your opinion and the reason for your position, I pray, now that this unexpected leisure has been granted to us, that you either lead me to your view by sound arguments — in which I have no doubt you abound beyond all the adherents of that assembly — or that, setting aside private feelings, you come over to the unity of the Roman See.

LUDOVICUS. I receive this long-desired exchange with eager countenance, so that you may know that you have up to now deviated from the right path; I shall make it clearer than light that I have up to now thought rightly. But since legal reasoning suggests that he who takes on the role of plaintiff must prove his case with fitting arguments, so that I may at last be able to clear myself more effectively, tell me of what you judge me to be guilty, so that, once your accusation has been brought into the open, the truth of the matter may become clear from any attempt at defense.

II. ANDREAS. I will do so, complying with sound reasoning. I have judged you guilty, not without astonishment, for this reason: that you persist at Basel, since I have perceived that those there who oppose the Roman Pontiff — from the time when the Council of Ferrara was proclaimed and established for the most holy work of union of the Orientals — are deserters of the Catholic Church's prelate, the Roman Pontiff, the one true Vicar of Christ, and are wanderers from the unity of the Church. Whether I have done rightly in this judgment, I most earnestly desire that we discern together. And since the crux of this matter is whether those residing at Basel represent the Church, I shall proceed further to inquire whether the principles of our religion establish the Christian religion under a single shepherd, or indeed under the power of many among the faithful.

For you know that this most holy law is furnished by faith to the followers of Christ — such that what the philosophers of the pagans sought morally or by reason, and for the most part fabricated as established in reality by the authority of the Delphic Apollo or the gods, as in those four invented divine precepts: to follow each god, to obey the time, to know oneself, to do nothing in excess — commanding through the fiction of the gods — that very thing has been given by the word of the first Deity to Christians, so that they may have the principles of religion from the very word of divine power itself made human. Therefore the words of God Himself are to be sought, which He established to be more enduring than heaven and earth, when He said: *"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away"* (Lk. 21:33). To depart from them is no less than to depart from God, for *"in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,*

and the Word was God" (Jn. 1:1). The first cause is immovable, and consequently the word of God is immovable.

Our Redeemer, about to depart from the world to the Father after the most holy time of the Resurrection, foreseeing that His disciples would need a head and a shepherd, said this to Simon Peter: *"Simon, son of John, do you love me more than these? Feed my sheep"* (Jn. 21:16–17). Shepherds do not need a shepherd — only sheep do; nor do foundations require foundations. It would have been in vain for Him to assert that the Church was to be built upon the rock of Peter, had He distributed equal power to all. To be the summit, the shepherd, and the foundation is nothing other than to be, after God, the cause of sustenance and governance. And asserting Peter's singular faith, when He said: *"I have prayed for you, Peter, that your faith may not fail"* (Lk. 22:32), He signifies nothing other than that the governance of the deposit of faith is under Peter's power. He offered a bodily sign when He said: *"And I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven"* (Mt. 16:19), the power of which demonstrates nothing more clearly than to establish the lord of a house, and to be able by one's own authority to cast out whomever one wishes and to admit whomever one wishes into the same. These things clearly intimate that Christ — whom we hold and believe to have been both God and man, whose words are proven by faith and also by reason to be immovable as the essence of the first cause — established the governance of the Church Militant under one shepherd, and did not will it to be ruled under the power of many.

This argument is taken from the principles of the word of God, the first foundations of faith, which *"surpass all understanding and subject all human reason"* (Phil. 4:7). This most wholesome ordinance would also be proven by reason, were it not that I would consider it ridiculous to prove the word of God by human reason — which indeed, by that same word, *"is foolishness with God"* (1 Cor. 3:19). It is handed down that He willed this lower spiritual monarchy of the Church Militant to be formed after the likeness of the higher, in which — although in the supreme goodness of God there is no envy nor desire of precedence, but rather God Himself desires every being to be like unto Himself — it is the highest opinion of all Catholics, indeed even of unbelievers, that there is one God and first cause over all other divine power, distinct from all other created goodness. He established Peter as governor of the faith, the summit and foundation of the Church — which would

have been superfluous to designate in the individual person of Peter, if He intended to give the power to all when gathered together. And if He had spoken words designating power to the assembled faithful disciples, He did not include Peter — to whom alone He had given governance — in a universal address, as the words intimate and as natural and written reason demonstrates.

From all of which I conclude: since there is one undoubted Vicar of Christ, striving with all his strength toward the union of the Eastern peoples and for that reason convening a universal ecumenical synod, I believe that you who abide at Basel have deviated from the article of faith of the one holy Catholic Church — by which it follows that I judge you to be strangers to the creed of the Christian religion. I have brought this forward on the occasion of these words, so that I may hear you responding most fully, etc.

III. LUDOVICUS. Even though I perceive that, in satisfying your inquiry, I cannot escape the form of accusation, yet so that this matter — which in the judgment of many has been thoroughly examined — may become clear in its particulars, I come to the question you raise: whether the Church was ordained by our Redeemer under the governance of one or of many. And thus you will receive a brief response.

I hold and firmly believe that Peter, the head of the Apostles, and his legitimate successors received the words you have cited above — but not as given for Peter's sake alone, but so that God spoke the words in Peter in order that He might comprehend the unity of the Church, with Augustine testifying: *"not he himself as an individual, but the unity of the Church received the keys"* — in the canon *Quodcumque*, C. 24, q. 1; *De summa trinitate*, c. 1 at the end; *De sententia excommunicationis*, q. *A nobis*. Hence also Augustine, in the book of *Questions on the Old and New Testament*, Question LXXIX, asserts: *"Peter, loosing the decree, was acting on behalf of all. And all things that were said to Peter were said to all the disciples as well; and if He prayed for Peter's faith, He prayed also for all the Apostles."* Jn. XVII (Jn. 17:9): *"for these I pray, whom you have given me, Father, and I will that where I am, they also may be"* (Jn. 17:24) *"and they themselves shall be there."* And if Peter was made a shepherd, hear Ambrose saying in his pastoral work, toward the end of the second column: *"Feed my sheep — he*

received the flock not alone, but together with us, and we together with him" (Jn. 21:17). As for the giving of the keys, even if it was made to Peter, was it not also to all the Apostles, when it was said: *"Receive the Holy Spirit; and those whose sins you forgive, they are forgiven, and in heaven"* etc. (Jn. 20:23)?

I grant that the Church is founded in Peter, who represents the assembly of the faithful. I believe that there was one governance in the Church admitted by the words of our Savior, which He wished to be represented — for the purpose of designating unity — in the person of Peter and in the other legitimate successors in the Roman See; not so that it could prevail against the Church which it represents, but insofar as it is the head of the Church, presiding over individuals individually and over those who do not constitute the Church in their plurality. But that Church which is represented in Peter, when legitimately assembled, which equally received the words of primacy and governance — though with a single living head in whom its power is represented, in which the power both of the head and of the members is comprised — I do not see how it should be subjected to that same head. I say therefore that our Savior, who is the discernor of supreme goodness, willed to establish a primacy in the unity of the Church, and that, so it might be represented in the person of one individual, He willed to appoint one head, in whom, without the assembled congregation of the Church, the Church would be represented. This is my correct belief, in conformity with the sayings of the saints — and thus, insofar as I have given my assent to the Basellers, no division from the unity of the Church has been made, except insofar as you would believe that the universal Church is at Ferrara, which will be discussed in another part of this disputation. But let this suffice as a response to the question posed.

IV. ANDREAS. You place the supreme power of the Church's governance in the Church, which you constitute by the assembly of the faithful, and hold that the head received the primacy in the name of the Church. I ask whether, when the Church is assembled, the power of this head is in force.

LUDOVICUS. If you consider what has been set out above, the answer is already given. Since Peter received the power of the Church in its unity, unless the Church opposes him, the power is in force; nor is it contrary to reason that the universal

power of the Church resides in the Church itself, and is exercised on behalf of the Church through one head — as has been stated in the most well-known teachings of the saints.

V. ANDREAS. I have been persuaded by your words that the power of the Church was granted by our Savior to Peter, so that in his individual person they might designate the unity of the Church, and that an equal power of the Church was handed over — which I demonstrate by reason to be contrary to reason. It is most well known that a primacy of two concurrent powers produces a schism. "*My beloved is one*" (Cant. 6:8): the episcopate of the one Church is one, the Church sings, as attested by the laws of the canons, C. 24, q. 1; and the canon suggests that two heads in one body are like a monster. If therefore a double universal power seems to have been left both in the universal Church and in the individual person of Peter, who would assert that divine providence rightly constituted this lower monarchy? Since it would have designated it as a kind of monster with two tribunals — how detestable this would be to divine goodness is suggested by the fall of the angels cast out of heaven.

I will not allow it, even if you say that Peter received the primacy not for himself but for the Church, and thus that there is one supreme tribunal of the Church. For the sacred canons suggest that Peter is not the vicar of the Church, but its head. If he is the Vicar of Jesus Christ, as the most holy Aurelius Augustine demonstrates in the book of *Questions on the New Testament*, in the question you cited, saying: "*just as all were contained in the Savior by reason of teaching, so after the Savior all are contained in Peter*" — because He established him as their head, so that he might be the shepherd of the Lord's flock; and the Lord's Church is — consider how detestable that must be deemed. You have transgressed against the norm of wisdom, against the boundaries set by the Fathers; and, to use the words of Jerome, you seem to me to have brought false scales, saying: by your own judgment this is light, that is heavy. The boundaries of the Christian religion are to be examined; what their enclosures intimate to us must be considered. From these you will then rightly perceive how perverse are the things you have brought forward on this matter. You know, if depraved interpretations had not offended the teaching of

piety, that the evangelical words alone would have sufficed for the Christian faith, since they contain all the aforesaid matter entirely?

LUDOVICUS. I know; for the most holy Council of Constantinople also attests to this.

ANDREAS. From that first offense, then, you know that the dogmas of councils and of many saints have been assigned, after the manner of the Gospels, as the boundaries of the faith?

LUDOVICUS. That the sayings of certain saints have acquired the force of the Gospels, I by no means believe.

ANDREAS. I do not say that the sayings of the saints acquire the force of the Gospels, but that they serve as the Gospels do in setting boundaries, when the discussion concerns the understanding of the Gospels.

LUDOVICUS. I know that the writings of many approved authors have been set as boundaries of the faith beyond the written Gospels.

ANDREAS. The things which seemed ambiguous from certain words of Scripture have therefore been settled by the opinions of many doctors; and just as it is not lawful for litigants to go against the authority of a decided matter, nor is it lawful for professors of theology to call into doubt what men received in the Church with long veneration of time, enlightened by the divine spirit, have set forth in clear discourse — and their testimonies have seemed of such great authority that, without inquiry into any other truth, when there was disagreement between Latins and Greeks concerning the knowledge of the Deity itself, it was said to those devout voices of those whom we used to consider unbelievers, on various occasions in public assemblies, that they would willingly submit their opinion and reasoning to the testimonies of the saints, which they do not think were uttered without the divine spirit — so much so that the testimony of Chrysostom alone put the longed-for end to doubt about the consecration of the most holy Body; how much more ought we also to subject our weak reason and understanding to the sayings of those whose memory we celebrate.

XI. It is therefore to be inquired what the sayings of those whose testimonies have been affixed to the sacred sentences of the councils as their boundaries intimate in this matter. For the most clear testimonies of our Savior have been brought into the open, and — so that you might divert from them — even if you have asserted that He spoke not to Peter but to the Church in Peter's representation, it has been most clearly answered that this cannot be accepted while preserving the meaning of the words, since Peter would then be said to be dismissed not as the Vicar of Christ, but as the vicar of the Church. If your interpretation were to proceed, he would have been given not as head, but as the representative of the head; not as a fisherman with a hook, but as one who received the exercise of fishing with a hook in the name of others — an exposition which would manifestly corrupt the understandings of the Savior and of the saints, because between Peter and the others who make up the remainder of the Church they bring forward things that are directly different from one another; the words spoken to the Apostles do not include all the Apostles equally. The primacy of Peter separates him from the Apostles, as the words clearly show. Therefore the power of Peter is set above all the Apostles and all who are not Apostles; and fishing with a hook was granted to Peter alone. Ambrose asserts: "*but to the others, the net*" (Ambrose, Super Lucam, lib. IV, c. 5, n. 70); therefore the distinction of the arrangements makes it so that what was said concerning Peter does not appear to have been granted to others; in which there is a non-uniform disposition made by the Savior within the same disposition. This argument concludes within its own terms; the law *Cum ex filio*, Digest *de vulgari et pupillari substitutione*, and the conclusion is most well known to anyone of understanding. Therefore it cannot be said that he received the primacy in the name of the Church.

Now, turning to the beginning of the documents provided: that the Lord's Church is as the domain of the Lord, as is most well known to all, in the canon *Ecclesia*, De consecratione, D. I (Decretum Gratiani, Pars III, De consecratione, D. 1, c. 8 = Friedberg I, 1296). If he is the shepherd of the flock, similarly he is, by God's disposition, the head of the Church as well. Who would not assert two powers, when one does not depend on the other, but is founded upon the command and authority of a superior — and it is not for men to alter what the word of God has

established, as the Apostle elegantly says, when he strikes with the sword of anathema not only men but even angels who counsel contrary things (Gal. 1:8)?

It is established that the primacy of the pontificate and the pastoral ministry and the mastery of the keys cannot faithfully be asserted to have been handed to Peter by the Church, but by the very fount of piety, the teacher of truth. Since, therefore, you cannot deny — and have expressly professed — that this power was handed to Peter by God, and even if you assert that he received it as head and shepherd in the representation of the Church, it is necessary to conclude either that there are two concurrent powers tending toward unity — which cannot exist in the unity of the Church, nor would it be fitting to the supreme goodness which disposed all things by right reason — or that, of these two powers, that one is superior which makes the more worthy part in this mystical body.

VI. It is to be considered which part was chosen as the more worthy: the whole Church, or Peter himself. Paul, the summit of the most sacred laws, together with the law establishing that when a religious place is constituted by the burial of a human body, if there is a division in the body, he decreed the head to be preferred over the whole body — in the law *Cum in divisis*, Digest *de religiosis* — where he says: "*when someone is buried in different places, the place does not in any case become a religious site, because one burial cannot make multiple tombs; it seems to me that the religious place is where the principal part has been laid, that is, the head, whose image it is, by which it is recognized*" (Justinian, D. XI, 7, 44); asserting in the same place that the body is deemed to be where the head is. By the authority of so great an author it is established that the head is more worthy than the entire rest of the body; and thus, if we assert Peter to be the head, the remainder of the Church is the true body, whose head Peter is — the members — which in the same place are deemed to reside where Peter resides.

Nor should you return to the settled question that the assembly of the other faithful, without Peter, contains the power of the Church — for this is most false and alien to the rules of piety — since God established Peter as shepherd, summit, and key-bearer; and it is the doctrine of all the saints, and of Augustine as above, and of Jerome in the canon *Quoniam vetus*, C. 24, q. 1, and in canons 1, 2, and q. *Haec est*

fides — where he asserts that he wishes "to be corrected in faith by the Supreme Pontiff, who holds both the faith and the see of Peter" — and of the most holy Leo in the same canon and question, *Cum beatissimus Petrus apostolus*, where he says: "Since the Roman Church first received its foundation from the Lord, let it abide in his ordinances" (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 16 = Friedberg I, 971); and in the same title and question, *Manet*, where he asserts: "The privilege of Peter remains; nothing shall be loosed or bound, save what Peter has loosed or bound" (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 5 = Friedberg I, 968). Likewise Ambrose, in the canon of the same title and question, where he asserts: "How can the ship be troubled, in which the foundation of the Church is?" and adds: "that a different and spiritual kind of fishing was entrusted to Peter alone when it was said only to him: cast the hook — whereas to the others he had commanded fishing with nets" (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 7–8 = Friedberg I, 969); and the same title and question, *Est aliud* (Friedberg I, 969). And these things cannot be verified as if he were acting in the place of another, but rather so that he might be the principal of this body, the sole prince and head — and thus without the head there is no body, nor, with the head removed, does the body have any faculty of acting.

From which I would judge at first sight, not without the taint of heresy, that it can be asserted that a council can take over the administration of what has been granted to the head — as if against the first ordinances of our faith and the words of piety, directly leading the form of religion, which is established in one prince, into popular confusion. How contrary to right order these things are, let him judge who knows the conditions of these two regimes.

VII. It remains for me to respond to the objections. When it was said to the Church "whatsoever you shall bind" etc. (Mt. 16:19), it is not to be denied — as the most blessed Alexander attests when writing to Saint Valerian, in the canon *Audivimus*, q. 1 (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 4 = Friedberg I, 967) — and that Peter represented the unity of the Church, as Augustine attests in his commentary on John, in the canon *Quodcumque* of the same title and question (Friedberg I, 968). But do not the canons of the saints demonstrate that this Church takes on the operations of the head? For what does Jerome mean when he says: "whoever does not gather with you, scatters", in the canon *Quoniam vetus* (Decretum Gratiani, C.

24, q. 1, c. 25 = Friedberg I, 976)? What does Ambrose mean when he says: "*how could the ship be troubled, over which he presided in whom the foundation of the Church is?*" (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 7 = Friedberg I, 969)? What does Leo mean when he says: "*nothing shall be bound save what the blessed Peter shall have bound or loosed?*" (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 5 = Friedberg I, 968)? What of the distinction of the fishing with the hook granted to Peter, which the blessed Ambrose distinguishes from the other Apostles? Do you not see that certain distinct things are asserted by the testimonies of the saints to have been entrusted to Peter — and thus all that the others received, he also had, and more besides, as head and prince?

Are the deeds of the saints, the actions of the Fathers, a matter of mockery? Where is the reverence of the holy first councils toward the See of Peter and toward the Roman Pontiff, Vicar of Christ? Examine the acts of Nicaea and Constantinople, where they decreed that nothing was to be done except at the command of the Roman Pontiff. What does the very letter of St. Julius mean, received by the whole East, where he asserts that nothing could be done in the absence of the legate of the Roman Church (Ps.-Julius = Hinschius, 471)? What is established in canon *Regula*, D. XVII (Decretum Gratiani, D. 17, c. 2 = Friedberg I, 51), in the same distinction, for this See? What does Symmachus himself say in the canon *Concilia*, in the same distinction, when he says: "*we hold those councils, and they have force, insofar as they retain the presence of the pope*" (Decretum Gratiani, D. XVII, c. 6 = Friedberg I, 52)? What is the point of transgressing the boundaries of the Fathers against the teaching of piety? What is the point of violating the sentence observed over long ages by the ancients, against the canon *Quanto, De translatione* (Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. I, t. 7, c. 3 = Friedberg II, 98), and the law *Testamentum*, canon *De testibus* (Justinian, C. IV, 20 = Krueger 158; C. VI, 23 = Krueger 253)? The instrument, the execution, and the effective operation of the body is the head. Peter is the head of the body of the Church Militant; we know from the word of God that the Church is represented in him — which it is not for men to alter without an augmentation of faith. Let the boundaries of religion, the dignities, the principates, stand firm by God's command, observed until now by the consent of the saints — let us not set our mouths against heaven out of private ambitions. What is there to be treated concerning superiority, unless, since it consists in the unity of all in the Church, which is established in its fullness in the person of Peter alone, we

venerate with all our strength this head as the glory of the Church and recognize it as the principal summit and glory, from which "*as branches from a trunk, as rivulets from a spring, all derive and flow*" — as the most holy Cyprian attests in the canon *Loquitur dominus*, C. 24, q. 1 (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 28 = Friedberg I, 972)?

VIII. I hold that there is one supreme tribunal in the Church Militant, which you have professed was designated in the body of Peter. And if the body of Peter alone suffices for the representation of the Church, then by the norm of piety, were he to assemble the universal Church in its entirety, the reason of the body would be no less in force in the head. But in this way I agree that there is a difference: that when there is no other assembly of the Church, a greater freedom of operations resides in the head, as even the gravest matters are referred to the most holy assembly of the cardinals; but when the universal Church is assembled — and even if, as has been shown, the power of decision resides in the head — the decrees of the Fathers convoked by him would not be disregarded without embarrassment, since all things done by right counsel receive the force of law: the law *Non dubium*, Codex *De republica* (Justinian, C. I, 14, 5 = Krueger 68). Hence the most Christian Emperor also asserts most aptly to the point in the law *Humanum*, Codex *De legibus* (Justinian, C. I, 14, 8 = Krueger 68): "*We wish the law to be established by all the eminent men of our palace, and treated by our most glorious assembly, conscript fathers; and if it pleases all, then for the law to be dictated, and again reviewed with all assembled, and when all have consented, to be recited in our name, so that it may be confirmed by the consent of all with the authority of our serenity.*" And he adds: "*For we well know that what has been ordained with your counsel redounds to our glory and the felicity of our empire.*"

But I think you are immediately bound to submit, according to this, that there is no power in the council. This indeed does not follow from what has been said above. I say that whatever has been granted to the Church by the word of piety persists unimpaired; but if they were to depart from what has been granted, the members are governed by the head — as by an individual or collectively assembled power — this I gather from your own words, even if it does not follow the counsels of the advisors; nor does it appear that the contrary can be gathered, that the members

should judge the head, lest the matter of superiority flow on to infinity. For it is naturally given that there be one immovable and supreme power in each thing, as all the sentences of the doctors, the saints, and the philosophers urge — which does not subsist under the laws of inferiors by force, but voluntarily. The most sacred law testifies: *"it is a voice worthy of the majesty of one who governs to profess himself bound by the laws"* (Justinian, C. I, 14, 4 = Krueger 68), so that what is supreme by necessity of nature may, of its own will and not by necessity, subject itself to the supreme; adding in the same place: *"and indeed it is a greater thing for empire to submit the principate to the laws"* — which, insofar as it applies as a person, it may profess; yet it cannot subject the dignity placed in the supreme position, nature and possibility being contrary. Hence Justinian most aptly says in the Authentic *De consulibus* at the end (Justinian, Nov. CV, c. 2, 4): *"all laws do not bind imperial fortune, to which God Himself has subjected the laws, sending it as the living law to men, so that from the head it may distribute all things to all cities and peoples."* Who could be seen as so insane a man of reason as to believe that the temporal summit — which God, constituted by God to be like the lesser light, composed by this rule to be governed and held as one solid unity — He would have left the spiritual, after the likeness of the greater light, to the greatest confusion, not reduced to one individual unity? I confess that Jesus Christ our Lord said many things to the Church, but that He established Peter and his legitimate successors as the head of the Church.

IX. LUDOVICUS. How foreign to the words of piety this belief of yours is, consider carefully. First: Matthew the Evangelist testifies in chapter XVIII that this power which you attribute to Peter is not consonant with the words of the Gospel, where it was related by our Redeemer to Peter: *"If your brother sins against you, go and reprove him between you and him alone. If he hears you, you have gained your brother. If he does not hear you, bring one or two with you; if he does not hear them, tell it to the Church; and if he despises the Church, let him be to you as a pagan and a tax collector"* (Mt. 18:15–16). Do you not see that He ordained the denunciation to be made to the Church, not to the pontiff, and that He ordains no power after the denunciation to the Church?

This is shown by clear reasoning. Is it not the word of God: "*where two or three are gathered in my name, there I am in the midst of them*" (Mt. 18:20), in canon *De quibus*, D. XX (Decretum Gratiani, D. 20, c. 3 = Friedberg I, 66)? If therefore God is in the assembly of the faithful, is He not greater than the pontiff? Certainly this is most well known. Did not Paul also rebuke Peter? — C. 2, q. VII, *Petrus* and c. *Paulus* and canon *Ipsi apostoli* (Decretum Gratiani, C. 2, q. 7, cc. 27, 28, 33 = Friedberg I, 494–495). Is it possible that you are unaware of this notorious matter: that the Supreme Pontiff can in certain cases be judged, and that the council is judge in those cases, as is commonly known, canon *Si papa*, D. XL (Decretum Gratiani, D. 40, c. 6 = Friedberg I, 146), and the gloss in the canon *Sicut inquit*, ii, q. VII (Decretum Gratiani, C. 2, q. 7, c. 7 = Friedberg I, 499)? Did not the disciples, in Acts VIII, send Peter and John (cf. Act. 8:14)? Therefore this indicates the superiority of those who sent, D. XCIV, in summary. Did not Peter, because he had approached the Gentiles, purge himself before the Church, Acts XI (cf. Act. 11:4 sqq.)? And the election of Matthias to the grade of apostleship — made not by Peter but by the Apostles — clearly indicates the superiority of the Church, Acts I and XX (cf. Act. 1:26).

Add to these especially canon *Precipue*, C. XI, q. iii (Decretum Gratiani, C. 11, q. 3, c. 3 = Friedberg I, 643), where the pope, speaking, asserts that he wishes to denounce the offender to the Church — which clearly designates the Church as superior — and canon *Quod quis*, C. XXXII, q. IX (Decretum Gratiani, C. 35, q. 9, c. 3 = Friedberg I, 1284). Does not Eleutherius also assert that it was defined by the Apostles and their successors that no one besides the Roman Pontiff was permitted to judge bishops — C. iii, q. VI, *Quamvis* (Decretum Gratiani, C. 3, q. 6, c. 7 = Friedberg I, 520), and in the same C. and q., *Dudum* (Decretum Gratiani, C. 3, q. 6, c. 9 = Friedberg I, 521) — where Pope Julius says it was decreed and established by the Apostles and others that a council could not be assembled without the authority of the pope? And have you not yourself observed that this lower monarchy was formed after the likeness of the higher? The higher is impeccable; therefore, so that the lower may be impeccable, it is not to be referred to the body of one person — since he can sin — but to the congregation of the faithful, in which the represented Church cannot sin, as C. 24, q. 1, *A recta fide* (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 9 = Friedberg I, 969). Likewise, the Roman Church is called mother, not mistress, D. XII, *Non decet* (Decretum Gratiani, D. 12, c. 1 =

Friedberg I, 27). What could be said more unseemly than that, when the Supreme Pontiff is notoriously scandalizing the Church, he cannot be corrected by any of the faithful, and he is permitted with impunity to indulge in his lusts? Did not our Redeemer, speaking to all the disciples and to Peter, say: "*there was a fig tree in the vineyard; when the lord saw it and perceived its fruitlessness, he said: wait one year more, and I will put dung around it; and if it does not improve, I will cut it down*" (Lk. 13:6–9)? What does this intimate other than that, after long patience with a prelate so that he might correct himself, if he does not repent, he is to be deposed and cut off from the Church by the judgment of the faithful? Moved indeed by these authorities, the most holy Council of Constance has already most wholesomely decreed, defining this doubt — that the sacred general synod legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit is in certain cases contained therein to be preferred to the authority of the pontiff — and since this matter has merited a decision, it is not fitting nor can it be called back into doubt, the sentence of a decided case barring the threshold of litigation.

X. ANDREAS. When I perceived the words of you who were speaking, I shuddered at what your intent was endeavoring — since it strives to disrupt the entire norm, unity, and peace of the Christian religion, by which...

[*Manuscript and editorial notes:*]

1: Ps.-Ambrose, *De dignitate sacerdotali*, c. 2 = Migne PL 17, 570 A. — 2: Jn. 21:17. — 4: Jn. 20:23. — 9: colump. with omission of abbreviation sign = columpne V. — 29: Cant. 6:8. — 31: Decretum Gratiani, C. XXIV, c. 18 (*Loquitur dominus*) = Friedberg I, 972. — 38: Ps.-Augustine, *Quaestiones veteris et novi testamenti*, c. 75 = Migne PL 35, 2270. — 40: omnes causae V. — Note: the author alludes to the declaration of the Greeks against the epiclesis understood in a schismatic sense. — 2: cf. allusions in Jerome, *In Osee*, 12, 7; *In Michaeam*, 6, 11 = Migne PL 25, 927 A; 1213 B–C. — 36: Ambrose, *Super Lucam*, lib. IV, c. 5, n. 70 = Migne PL 15, 1633 C. — Justinian, D. XXVIII, 6 (*De vulgari et pupillari substitutione*) = Mommsen 388. — Note on the Council of Florence, 5 July 1439

20: before *omnibus* a deletion mark is placed in the manuscript. — 2: Lk. 22:32. — 4: Mt. 16:19. — 5: *hedificandam* V. — 10: Phil. 4:7. — 13: 1 Cor. 3:19. — 21: *catolicae* V. — 34: *vetis* with omission of abbreviation sign V. — 35: Decretum Gratiani, Pars II, C. 24, q. 1, c. 6 (*Quodcumque*) = Friedberg I, 968; Decretales Gregorii IX, Lib. I, t. 1, c. 1 (*Firmiter*) = Friedberg II, 5. — 36: citation not found. — 37: Ps.-Augustine, *Quaestiones veteris et novi testamenti*, c. 76 = Migne PL 35, 2269–70 (citation not verbatim). — 40: read Jn. XVII; Jn. 17:7; 17:9; 17:24. — Note on Council of Basel: the Council of Basel had conditionally been transferred to Ferrara on 19 September 1437, and definitively on 30 December 1437: cf. *Ep. pontif.* I, n. 88 and 108, pp. 91–99, 111–112.

After the evangelical testimony, I shall take up the synodal testimonies. The acts of the African Council survive, where the Fathers write thus to the Supreme Pontiff: "*To the most blessed and honorable Lord Boniface: Aurelius, Valentinus, primates of the see of the province of Numidia, and the others present, two hundred and seventeen. Now certain messengers have come from the blessed memory of Zosimus, in whose place you have been divinely appointed, by whom mandates and letters have been brought to us*" etc. If an equal or inferior were to issue mandates to his superior, experience — the teacher of affairs — shows how great an insanity he would deserve to be charged with, since jurisdiction is founded in nothing more than in the issuing of mandates and in the obedience to those mandates. When the Fathers report that apostolic mandates were brought to them from the council, who can doubt that superiority is demonstrated in the one who issues the mandates? Certainly those mandates and their bearers would have deserved to be annulled, had they received them as such.

Let there be added to these the general synod of the most blessed Hilary, where the following letter of the Tarraconensians is found, recited and approved by the common sentence of all: "*To the most blessed Lord and Pope Hilary: all the bishops of the province of Tarraconensis. Even if no necessity of discipline stood, we should in truth have awaited that privilege of your see, by which, after the keys of the kingdom were received following the resurrection of our Savior, the singular preaching of the most blessed Peter throughout the whole world provided for the enlightenment of ministers. Whose vicar's principate, as it is eminent, so must it be feared and loved by all. Wherefore first worshipping the Lord in you, to whose seat*

we have recourse — praised by the apostolic mouth — seeking responses from thence, from whence nothing of error, nothing of presumption, but all is commanded by pontifical deliberation." When this letter was read in the general council, the council acclaimed: *"We ask that antiquity be preserved"; "We ask that discipline be preserved"; "We ask that the canons be kept"; "We ask that the apostolic ordinance be kept inviolate"; "Hear us, O Christ. Long life to Hilary!"; "Worthy pope, worthy teacher."* Do you consider whether these words demonstrate the pontiff as subject or as superior? Tell me, I ask: if long life is acclaimed for Hilary; if he is called worthy teacher; if he is declared the enlightener of the whole world; if he is asserted by all to be worthy of fear; if we venerate his person after God — are further authorities still needed? Whether these things clearly demonstrate his superiority, certainly no one can doubt.

Let there follow the synodal letter of Pope Anastasius to the Emperor Anastasius, whose words are these: *"At the commencement of my pontificate I promise the peace first offered to the peoples; and consequently, that the most august height of your name may lend aid to the holy Church — so that, as the supreme name of your piety shines throughout all peoples throughout the whole world, so too through the ministry of my humility, as always, the see of the most blessed Peter may hold the principate assigned to it by the Lord God over the universal Church."* Hear also the words of the most blessed Pope Symmachus in the general council in the basilica of the blessed Apostle Peter in Rome, where, with all the Fathers standing present, Fulgentius the archdeacon said: *"Your Beatitude has directly convoked this synod through the provinces by your authorities, whose presence is set before your very eyes. Now let Your Beatitude deign to order tractably whatever pertains to the harmony or peace of the churches."* The acclamation was made: *"Long life to Symmachus!"; "We ask that you act"* was said. Do superiors ask an inferior to act in those matters that require public administration? Certainly this is contrary to reason and to written law. The request therefore, the acclamation of long life, and the faculty of ordering demonstrate the most well-known superiority.

— together with the sacred college of cardinals, in whom we perceive, hold, believe, and venerate with the constant observance of time the power of the whole Church to be comprised.

XIX. The canon *Quamvis* and the canon *Dudum*, adduced to the contrary, rightly demonstrate the power of the Roman Church. And when you assert that the power of not judging pontiffs by anyone other than the pope, and of not assembling a general council, was defined by the Apostles and the councils — certainly this is not a good argument: this council defines it, therefore it has been made definite by a council. In the definitions of councils are contained both the norms of faith and those things which had been established by the ancients. For the word of wisdom says: "*Do not transgress the boundaries of the Fathers*" (Prov. 22:28), and the teaching of the Apostles also intimates the same. Moreover, faith and dogmas of this kind have been defined through councils — and if anyone were to say they were produced by the councils, he would certainly be saying what is notoriously false. For faith and sacred Scripture are immovable, as first principles, and admit of no change; the definitions that follow from them do not create anything new, but declare what already exists. And thus these canons intimate that the councils defined these powers of the Roman Church — not as though they were given by the councils, since those same pontiffs assert that the Roman Church obtained its primacy not from men but from God, and not through councils but that by it the councils were established — but rather that from the words of piety and the principles of our faith they are in agreement, as is clearly gathered from all the definitions of the holy councils, by which those things are defined whose contrary could not be accomplished by councils.

You add that one person can sin; it has been answered above that he is not to be believed to sin, since he either finds holiness or produces it; and if as an individual person he wished to sin, he is not found to have erred in faith together with his college of cardinals, as has been repeated frequently.

I grant that she is not mistress but mother; but it is the office of fathers to correct erring children without punishment, to favor the good, and even in times of necessity to sell and pledge children — as in the title *De correctione propinquorum* and in the title *De patribus qui filios distraxerunt* (Justinian, C. IX, 65, 1; C. IV, 43, 1). If those subject to her comport themselves as children, there is certainly no domination; but if as rebels, the more gravely and confidently must they be restrained than even slaves.

XX. And when you add that it is absurd that he should be able to wander with impunity — this, as I have asserted, is not to be believed; and it is more just to judge that what he does operates in right order, than to loosen the reins on subjects against the head and to judge concerning his person — than which nothing more dangerous is seen in the right unity of the Church.

When indeed you bring forward the decision of the Council of Constance, read what has been said above concerning councils and the dogmas of the saints. Do you not know that a sentence against a sentence is by the law itself null? — in the law *l. 1 C. quando provocare* and canon *inter monasterium de re iudicata* (Justinian, C. VII, 64, 10 = Krueger 326–7; Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. II, t. 17, c. 20 = Friedberg II, 403–5). Lest it contradict the preceding conclusions of the saints, that decision is to be understood in the case where the pope would deviate from the notoriously decided norms in matters of faith, or in the cases in which the dogmas of the aforesaid saints establish that this may be done. But to speak with moderation: what was the zeal of the Basellers? If you examine their votes in particular, you will perceive no zeal of religion, no zeal of God, no object of the union of the Christian religion — but only the pursuit of private ambitions, the acquisition of private dignities, and the revenge of personal grievances. How much weight these carry in a sentence on faith, judge for yourself. If we rightly consider the words of God, the sayings of the saints, the decrees of the councils, and the expedient course for the Christian religion, there is no one who would not assert that there exists a single head of religion, to protect the faith, to divert schisms, to preserve unity —

[Manuscript and editorial notes:]

1: Council of Africa, year 444, cf. Mansi 4, 511B (where the title only). — 4: Zosamo V. — 11: read Hilari. — 12: Teracenensis V. — 13: read expetendum. — 15: ministro illuminatori V. — 19: deliberationi V. — 20–22: Thiel 163. — 22: read Hilaro. — 23: Illario V., read Hilaro. — 28: epistola Anastasii ii papae ad Anastasium imperatorem = Thiel 615–6. — 32: Simaci V. — 33: epistola Symmachi papae (decretum synodale) = Thiel 644–5. — 35: que ubi ecclesiarum V. — 36: vel ubi pacem V. — 39: demonstrat V. — 3: cf. above, Friedberg I, 520,

521. — 5: consilio V. — 8: Prov. 22:28. — 9: consilia V. — 10: consilia V. — 13: consilia V. — 18: Addit V. — 22: cf. Justinian, C. IX, 65, 1; titulus: De emendatione propinquorum. — 23: Justinian, C. IV, 43, 1; titulus: De patribus qui filios distraxerunt. — 31: Justinian, C. VII, 64, 10 = Krueger 326–7; titulus: Quando provocare necesse non est; Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. II, t. 17, c. 20 (Inter monasterium) = Friedberg II, 403–5.

Now continuing with the sections from documents 5–11:

XII. Let there be added testimonies clearer than light from two most holy councils held at St. Peter's in Rome in the time of Pope Symmachus. In the first synod, therefore, when the alienation of Church property by laymen — approved by certain bishops gathered in council — was being treated, at the insistence of the prefect of the praetorium and a patrician acting in the name of the emperor, the holy synod uttered these words: *"The holy Fathers have decreed that alienations of ecclesiastical goods are void; how much more, since without the presiding bishop of the apostolic see — who, holding the primacy throughout the entire world by the prerogative of merit of the blessed Apostle Peter, is accustomed to give firmness to synodal statutes — it is beyond doubt that what was done by laymen, even with the assent of certain bishops who could not prejudice the Church, lacks legal force."* *"I, Caelius, bishop; I, Symmachus, bishop of the catholic Roman Church, have subscribed to this constitution made by us. I, Laurentius, bishop of the holy see of the church of Milan, have subscribed to this constitution made by the true pope Symmachus"* etc.

The second is even clearer. When the fourth synod had been assembled in Rome at the insistence of Theodoric, so that the Fathers of the council should judge Symmachus, and the Fathers seeing that the convocation of the council had not been made by the authority of the pope, said to the emperor that he *"who was said to be impeded ought to have convened the council, knowing that the first merit and principate of his see is that of the Apostle Peter. Then, following upon the command of the lord, the authority of councils had power"* — but *"the holy Pope*

Symmachus entered the basilica in which the assembly of the pontiffs was gathered, and gave thanks to God for the convening of the synod, and testified to the most clement king that the matter of his desire had come to pass. The Fathers held from that moment that the council was confirmed, and the cause which had been ministering sadness ceased." And when complaints were introduced against Symmachus, and while the pope himself wished to plead his cause, *"he was so treated by the rushing crowds of his rivals that, in that very violence, many of the priests who were with him found occasion for death."* The Fathers, having weighed all things with mature consideration, declared that Pope Symmachus, the presiding bishop of the apostolic see, assailed by various accusations, as far as it regards men, was clearly left to divine judgment. *"Let him therefore be immune and free", "since we recognize that he could not be bound by the petition of attack, being subject to God alone", "reserving the whole cause to the judgment of God."* *"For it is written through the prophet in the person of God: 'Is it not the case that my hand is not strong enough to consume those who have erred?'"* (cf. Jer. 27:8) And they subscribed: *"I, Laurentius, bishop of the church of Milan, have subscribed to this our statute, in which we have committed the whole cause to the judgment of God. I, Peter, bishop of the church of Ravenna, have subscribed to this our statute, in which we have committed the whole cause to the judgment of God"* and the following, etc.

Do you see these most clear synodal testimonies of the first see, which by so repeated a promulgation would constitute not merely a sentence but also a law — against which not even a synodal sentence could go, sentence being against sentence — and because the contrary of any decree promulgated against the express determination of the law, remaining defined by so many synodal constitutions and by the sentence of the Holy Spirit, is superfluous to enumerate? But enough regarding the sayings of the councils.

XIII. What do the sentences of the saints approved in the Church indicate? Leo — called the *"fiery column of faith"* by the ecumenical synods — who was filled with the Holy Spirit, which is a uniform spirit, hear what he intimates concerning the power of the Supreme Pontiff in his letter to Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica (Leo I, ep. 14 = Migne PL 54, 663 A–B): *"Leo, bishop of the city of Rome, to*

Anastasius. How great are the things committed to your fraternity from the authority of the most blessed Peter — if you would regard them with true reason — we could rejoice greatly at the cares of solicitude enjoined upon you, since just as my predecessors did to yours, so also I, following the example of those who came before, have delegated to your love the duties of my moderation, so that you might assist the church of Thessalonica principally from the divine institution, which we owe to all the churches, as an imitator of our gentleness."

Hear also the letter of the same Leo, in which the ecclesiastical monarchy is designated in precise terms, which begins *Ita ut a prestituto tempore* (Leo I = Migne PL 54, 675 A), where he says: "*When the brethren shall have believed that something must be treated and decided, and the opinion shall have differed from the common will, let all things be brought to us under the attestation of records, so that, with ambiguities removed, what pleases God may be decreed.*" And he adds: "*For the firm structure of our unity will not be able to stand, unless the bond of charity binds us to inseparable solidity — for just as we are many members in one body and have members, and all members do not have the same act, so we are many and one body in Christ, and individually members one of another*" (Rom. 12:5; 1 Cor. 12:12). "*The connection of the whole body makes one health, one beauty. Indeed the connection of the whole body requires unanimity*" (Leo I = Migne PL 54, 675 B–676 A), "*since also among the most blessed apostles, in the similarity of honor, there was a certain distinction of power, and although the election of the Lord was equal, yet it was said to one that he should be pre-eminent over the rest — from which form the distinction of bishops arose, and by a great ordinance it was provided that not all should claim everything for themselves, but that there should be in each province individuals whose prior sentence among the brethren should be had, and again that certain ones in the greater cities should take on ampler solicitude, through whom the care of the universal Church might flow into one see, and nothing anywhere should be at variance with its head. And he who knows himself to be set over some should not take it amiss that someone is set over all*" (Migne PL 54, 676 A–677 A). "*We are disciples of the humble and gentle teacher who says: 'Learn from me, because I am meek and humble of heart. He who exalts himself shall be humbled, and he who humbles himself shall be exalted'*" (Mt. 11:29). Do you see how beautifully this man, full of the divine spirit and judged by the holy councils, intimates the monarchical firmness of the Church

and designates the one primacy of the Roman See — Peter being pre-eminent over all the other Apostles and disciples, in whose representation the remainder of the Church had been designated?

XIV. But what is clearer than the testimony of the most blessed Gregory in the homily on the Lord's Resurrection (Gregory the Great, Homilia 2, c. 4, cited according to Decretum Gratiani, D. 50, c. 53 = Friedberg I, 198), who says: *"We must consider why Almighty God permitted him whom He had disposed to place over all the churches to fear the voice of a maidservant and to deny himself — which we know was assuredly done by a great dispensation, so that he who was to be the shepherd of the Church might learn from his own fault how he ought to have mercy on others."* To this testifies another doctor of the Church, Ambrose, in the homily of the same day (Ps.-Ambrose, cited according to Decretum Gratiani, D. 50, c. 54 = Friedberg I, 198), saying thus: *"Peter became more faithful after he wept for having lost the faith; and therefore he found greater grace than he had lost. For like a good shepherd he received the care of the flock, so that he who had before been weak in himself might become a foundation for others. Finally, he is called a rock for the solidity of the churches, because he first laid the foundations of faith among the nations, and like an immovable stone he holds together the structure and mass of the entire Christian body."*

These are the clear testimonies of two lights of the Church, noted in canon *Considerandum* and in canon *Fidelior*, D. L (Decretum Gratiani, D. 50, cc. 53–54 = Friedberg I, 198). Do these accord with your opinions? Does not the most blessed Clement also say, in canon *In illis*, D. LXXX (Decretum Gratiani, D. 80, c. 2 = Friedberg I, 280), that the Apostle Peter was set over all, and most carefully ordained primates or patriarchs in the cities where the chief flamines of the pagans had been, and archbishops where the archflamines had been?

There are also the clear testimonies of other holy Roman pontiffs: of Anacletus in canon *In novo*, D. XIX (Decretum Gratiani, D. 21, c. 2 = Friedberg I, 69–70); of Pelagius [Gelasius] in the same distinction, *Quamvis* (Decretum Gratiani, D. 21, c. 3 = Friedberg I, 280); of the same Anacletus in canon *Sacrosancta*, D. XX (Decretum Gratiani, D. 22, c. 2 = Friedberg I, 73–4); and of the most blessed

Nicholas in canon *Omnes* of the same distinction (Decretum Gratiani, D. 22, c. 1 = Friedberg I, 73) — where they clearly intimate that the word by which heaven and earth were built founded the Roman Church, the fount of the priesthood of all others. Does not the most holy Cyprian testify to this in C. 24, q. 1, *Loquitur dominus* (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 18 = Friedberg I, 971–2)?

Although all the letters of these supreme pontiffs have been received by a great army of saints with the greatest veneration — since the pontiffs themselves are inscribed in the catalogue of the saints — the arrogance of certain persons dares with shameless audacity to say that the pontiffs bore testimony in their own causes; not perceiving how openly Jerome sets the decisions of the supreme Roman pontiffs above all the dogmas of the saints, in the canon *Haec est fides*, C. 24, q. 1 (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 14 = Friedberg I, 970), and in the same cause and question, *Quoniam vetus* (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 25 = Friedberg I, 975–6); and not knowing the decrees of the most sacred emperors, received by the assent of the whole world, by whose norms even the status of consular men depends — which establish the Roman See as the fount of the priestly order, the head, mistress, and teacher of the churches: in the Authentic *De ecclesiasticis titulis imperii* (Justinian, Nov. CXXXI [Auth. CXIX], c. 2 = Kroll 655), and in the letter *Inter claras, De summa trinitate et fide catholica* (Justinian, C. I, 1, 8 = Krueger 10).

Are these testimonies to be neglected — which are given by those to whom human reason submits, who are the living judges both of religion and of morality: namely the imperial dignity of morals, against whose decisions he who inquires from reason incurs the crime of sacrilege (Justinian, C. IX, 29, 2 = Krueger 385), and the pontifical power of religion, against whose decision the wish to know better is heresy, as Jerome says: "*This is the faith*"? Let the dogmas of moral philosophers fall silent from discussing with private reason what the laws have already decided — and let them not wish to take pride in private judgments — and thus let them assent to the decisions of theologians, of councils, and of the saints, already decided in the canons and confirmed by long observance. For there would be no end to litigation if matters settled by sentence were to receive fresh investigation at the complaint of any private individual. The deciders of particular disputes are private judges; the princes of reason, equity, and religion are themselves those

authorities. Yet I grant that certain most well-known principles of faith are fixed, received in the common creed by the assent of the faithful in the first cradles of faith — in which there is no power of princes, since they came clearly from God. And thus we assert in the temporal prince that those things which have been issued by natural law itself remain immutable and do not receive alteration by imperial law without cause, according to the law of nature, of nations, and of civil law, but not natural things. But beyond the things of faith that are clear and indubitable, in spiritual matters the successor of Peter —

in temporal matters the imperial majesty is set over all the powers of the world — by the words of Christ, by the sentences of councils, by the testimonies of the saints, by the decisions of the most holy canons and laws, and by the common sense of those subject to them. Let him who calls these into doubt consider those against whom he is opposing himself.

XV. What does that holy Thomas Aquinas testify most abundantly to these things — whose renown shines throughout the whole world — as you may see in D. XXIV of the Fourth Book of the *Sentences* (Thomas Aq., In IV libros Sententiarum, Dist. XXIV, art. 2, q. 3 = Parma ed. II, 902), where among other things he says: *"So that there might be order in religion, the power was first given by God to Peter alone, for which reason it was said to him singularly: 'Strengthen your brothers'"* (Lk. 22:32). And you may see the same in the Fourth Book *Contra Gentiles*, c. LXXVI (Thomas Aq., Summa contra gentes, lib. IV, c. 76 = Leonine ed. XV, 241), where he says: *"Since it is necessary that the faithful agree in the faith, and in new doubts of faith it would be fitting to raise questions, on account of the diversity of opinions the Church would be divided, unless it were preserved in unity by the sentence of one."* And since John in the Apocalypse testifies, Apoc. XXI (Apoc. 21:10): *"I saw the holy city of Jerusalem descending from heaven"* etc.; and it was said to Moses that he should make all things *"according to the pattern"* as was shown on the mountain (cf. Num. 8:4); and in the Church Triumphant one God presides — so that this lower Church, in the sentences of the aforesaid, might be similar to the higher, it must be governed by one head. And

therefore the Lord said that there should be *"one fold and one shepherd"* (Jn. 10:16), which the ancient law demonstrated clearly in figure, where the judgment of Moses was set before the idolatry of the whole people, as we read in D. XCIII (Decretum Gratiani, D. 93, c. 24 = Friedberg I, 327–9). Let there be no one who says Christ is this head. For St. Thomas declares in the same place: *"Because Christ was not going to be present in body with the faithful, He chose ministers through whom He might dispense the sacraments to the faithful, and therefore He promised the keys to Peter — first, so that it might be shown that the power of the keys was to be derived through him to others, for the unity of the Church."*

And since the sayings of this most holy man bearing on the proposition, through seventy-three questions, have been written out by that most religious man conspicuous in holiness and eloquence, Lord Johannes de Turrecremata — you should examine those, from which you will rightly and clearly perceive that you have thought wrongly. The rule and unity we gather in human bodies — since God established the human race from one man — in which He wished to show how pleasing unity in many is, according to Augustine in *De civitate dei* (Augustine, *De civitate dei*, lib. 12, c. 27 = Migne PL 41, 376), where he adds: *"One man was made"*, though He could have made many. *"Nothing is more discordant in vice and yet more social by nature than this race, nor is there anything more fitting against the vice of discord — whether to prevent it from arising or to heal it if it should arise — than for human nature to speak and give the remembrance of a parent; and for this reason He willed to create one, from whom a multitude might be propagated, so that by this admonition a harmonious unity might be preserved in the many."*

XVI. Now consider how easily what you have brought against us may be refuted, and give judgment yourself: that he who refuses to correct himself is to be referred to the Church — this has nothing to do with the power of the pontiff; this is indeed a common rule, a common precept of all truly Catholic persons. Do you think that what is said in common to all binds even the supreme Vicar of Christ? Certainly if you believed this, I would judge you not to be thinking rightly. Those things which are protected by a special constitution are never comprehended by a common constitution — this you know, we who devote our effort to the law, to be most true.

And it is no wonder if He wished to have referred to the assembly for the sake of confusion, so that the greater contumacy might be seen through the confusion of many. These things do not conflict with the special words of Christ, who willed Peter to be the prince and shepherd of all; and if he is the head, the denunciation to be made to the Church would be made to the head himself, in whose person the unity of the Church is designated — as you yourself have just set forth in your own words.

When you assert that Peter was rebuked by Paul, do you not also read that Balaam was rebuked by a donkey, in the canon *Item cum Balaam*, ii q. VII (Decretum Gratiani, C. 2, q. 7, c. 41 = Friedberg I, 496–7)? Would you argue that Balaam was subject to his donkey? Why do we cite the sayings of the saints in a calumnious spirit? Let us refer to the intention of the teacher, who cites the testimony of the most blessed Gregory saying in the same place (Gregory I, cited according to Decretum Gratiani, C. 2, q. 7, c. 40 = Friedberg I, 496): "*Peter had received the power of the kingdom*" and "*yet the first of the apostles*", having entered among the Gentiles, received complaints from the faithful — and not from the power of his office, by which he could have said that sheep do not restrain the shepherd, but humbly responded that the Gentiles had received the Holy Spirit (cf. Act. 10:47); and thus our Savior also asserted: "*Who can convict me of sin?*" (Jn. 8:46).

When you disclose the notorious matter that the pope can in certain cases be judged by the faithful, I would by no means accept this; and lest I make a long speech on this matter, there are very many foundations of our faith from which whoever deviates is judged a heretic and separated from the unity of the faithful — as the prohibitions of the four first councils intimate, and the decretal letters *De summa trinitate* throughout (Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. I, t. 1 = Friedberg II, 5), and the most sacred decrees of the Christian princes. It was then rightly established that in a heretic there is no dignity, and by the very fact that he is a heretic he is lesser than any Catholic — as is intimated in the canon *Achatius*, C. 24, q. 1 (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 1 = Friedberg I, 966), and the common saying drawn from the deeds of Boniface the martyr, canon *Si papa*, D. XL (Decretum Gratiani, D. 40, c. 6 = Friedberg I, 146). Then, if any of the pontiffs were to decline from the undoubted precepts of our faith, I hold that the authority of Ezekiel, c. XIII, would follow (Ez. 13:5). When the faith is attacked, it is necessary "*that they*

rise up in opposition" and in the day of battle to put themselves "*as a wall for the house*" of the Lord and "*lay down their lives for their sheep*" (cf. Jn. 10:11) — concerning which, canon *Adversitas*, C. VII, q. 1 (Decretum Gratiani, C. 7, q. 1, c. 48 = Friedberg I, 586). And it is noted in the same place that such a faculty was not given except when it concerned manifest decliners from the faith — and thus this is known not concerning the pontiff but concerning every humbler member of the faithful. It is therefore no wonder that, if he has ceased to be the head, the members may declare that to be true, and that the body would present itself as without a head. But if any doubt should arise, the sentence of the head alone would terminate the judgments of those differing, even if it adheres to the opinion of the fewer.

This is gathered more clearly from the general council held at Ariminum (Council of Rimini, 359), where when the question of substance arose — which had not been declared before — and when those opposing and wishing to remove the word *homoousios* contradicted, the Roman Pontiff approved the votes of the forty Catholics, as is clearly gathered from the authentic acts of that same council. And this in particular you should inscribe in the shrine of your breast: that in a decree of faith, when new doubts arise — and in those matters in which the power of councils is greatest — so great is the pontifical majesty. What then is to be said of other matters, which are subject to his free judgment?

XVII. And when you assert that "*where two or three are gathered in my name*" (Mt. 18:20), the Holy Spirit is in the midst of them — I want you to consider whether you believe that God is present in any assembly lawfully convened. It is the opinion of all doctors that, for an election made by several persons lawfully gathered, if the consent is unanimous, it is believed to have been made by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit; therefore the assembly of however few would be preferred to the pope, because the Holy Spirit is among them. But I know you will immediately respond that no one is given the faculty of assembling to correct the head, except the universal Church — and this has been clearly demonstrated to be false by many authorities. Hence, when you intimate that the presence of the Holy Spirit in the congregation of the faithful operates in nothing except in what is fitting to that assembly, it is concluded that the presence of the Holy Spirit, which is in the congregation of the faithful, will accomplish nothing when they act

beyond what is fitting to them. But it is most unfitting for members to wish to dispose of the head, as has been shown by many sayings of the saints; therefore the Holy Spirit ceases to operate in them, since they do things not fitting to their ministry.

But also in those cases in which the law permits the council when gathered to make a declaration over the pope, as has been reported, I hold it to be true — if the unanimous assent of all accrues — that it may appear to be the sentence of the Holy Spirit. For in order that what is done with the vote of many may be asserted to have been done in unity, I hold that the unanimous consent of all is required. For in Exodus XXIV, when the words of the law had been heard from Moses, *"the whole people answered with one voice"* (Ex. 24:2 cf.); and in Judges XX, *"all the children of Israel were gathered together as one man"* (Jud. 20:1 cf.); and in Kings XI: *"the fear of the Lord seized the people and they entered as one man"* (1 Reg. 11:7); and Numbers VIII: *"all Israel was gathered as one man in the square"* (2 Esd. 8:1); and Ezra XIII: *"the people were gathered as one man in Jerusalem"* to rebuild the temple (1 Esd. 3:1); and Acts I: after the Ascension of the Lord all the disciples were *"persevering unanimously in prayer"* (Act. 1:14), and thus the Holy Spirit found them; and in Acts IV, when the disciples had heard of the healing of the lame man and of Peter's response to the magistrate of the people, *"they lifted up their voice unanimously"* (Act. 4:24); and in Acts V, when Ananias and his wife were struck down at the voice of Peter, *"great fear came upon the whole church"* and *"they were all unanimously in the porch of Solomon"* (Act. 5:11–12); and in Acts IV, *"the multitude of believers were of one heart and one soul"* (Act. 4:32). And the sacred canons assert that acts proceed from the operation of the Holy Spirit when no diversity accrues to the perfection of the act, but the unanimous and spontaneous will of those acting carries the matter through — in the decretal letter *Quia propter de electione* (Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. I, t. 6, c. 42 = Friedberg II, 89).

From all of which I gather this one thing: that if there is no unity of wills, the operation of the Holy Spirit is held to be absent in that place, even in the cases in which the Church would otherwise have power; for with the head removed, the power of the head is absent, and with the unanimous vote not given, the operation of the Holy Spirit is absent. For in order that even in those cases in which the

power to operate is permitted to the assembled council, I would think it ought to be conceded to them — converging in unanimous voice by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit — that if there were any dissension, I would believe that nothing could be constituted, and recourse would have to be had to the judgment of the head, in whose unity it is most indubitable that the power was arranged by God; and if that were not possible because he were dead, so that the dispositions might obtain force, it would be necessary that a head be first constituted, and the members should not take on authority with the presumptuous audacity of administering, as you yourselves are seen to do in altering the principles of our religion. If these be the case in those matters where the power is otherwise transmitted to a council, what I would think in other conjectures — as if in the council, when a dispute arose among the Fathers with the pontiff present or with those acting in his place — I certainly do not doubt that I would attribute the total authority of deciding to the head.

XVIII. That the holy Peter was sent by the Apostles: this calumniates so great a see most lightly, he who attempts from this to suppress the dignity of Peter fortified by the mouth of God. This is not an argumentation worthy of so great a matter. The responses of the writers are clear, asserting: the army sends the dictator; and because the operation of the acceptance of the word of God, which had taken place in Jerusalem, required the presence of the head. For since every action of Christ was for the instruction of the Apostles, and since they had seen that our Redeemer wished Peter and John for trusted witnesses in the secret divine ministries — as at the Transfiguration on the mountain, in the secret prayer which He offered to the Father in the garden after supper — in bearing testimony to this divine inspection, Peter and John were required. And so Peter came together with John, so that those who had known other divine things might come to know by night what had been given only to them first to know of the divine mysteries: to the one when it was said, *"You are the Christ, the Son of the living God"* (Mt. 16:17); to the other when it was declared, *"And the Word was made flesh"* (Jn. 1:14). For individual witnesses converge in their individual testimonies; but those who are disposed by God or by divine law — nor is the power seen from the sending, but from the

cause; the cause was that, if children were to send their father, the cause of the sending would require the father.

When indeed the canon *Precipue* and the canon *Quod quis* intimate that the pope threatens to refer the offender to the Church, certainly the power of greater authority is not argued from this. I grant that there are more people in the assembly of the Church than in the individual person of the pope; I grant that there are the judgments of the many; I grant that one is to be blamed with greater contumacy if referred to the assembly of the Church and is not ashamed, than if to the pontiff alone. For pertinacity is argued from the shameless perseverance in evil; hence manifest offenses require manifest punishment, canon *i de poenis* (Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. V, t. 38, c. 1 = Friedberg II, 884). Hence if someone should ask me whether a matter is said to be weighed with more mature counsel if subjected to the judgment of many rather than of the prince alone, I would certainly not hesitate — the law *Humanum*, Codex *De legibus* defining this (Justinian, C. I, 14, 8 = Krueger 68). If someone who offends is said to sin more gravely in the face of all those gathered than if seen only by the pontiff alone, I will certainly openly profess that he sins more gravely; but the laws hold this to be impossible in the presence of a prince, unless the judgment of many be present — as the law *Omnium*, Codex *De testamentis* (Justinian, C. VI, 23, 19 = Krueger 254; Julius Paulus, Sententiae 5, 15 = Seckel-Kuebler 139). But although the laws hold it to be impossible, if I were to set the prince alone before someone I saw to be offending, I would certainly not constitute it a public act, nor would I require a public penalty. Thus not without reason the pontiff, in order to charge him with being more pertinacious in offence, asserts the threat of denunciation to be made to the Church. But I would also call the Church in that case the college of cardinals, as the archdeacon clearly puts it in the canon *A recta*, C. 24, q. 1 (Decretum Gratiani, C. 24, q. 1, c. 9 = Friedberg I, 969). And thus the lesser power of the apostolic see will not be argued from this, if we were to assert that the prince would refer the matter to his council — that is, to the college of cardinals. And since the council of the pope, namely the college of cardinals, together with the head, has never been found to have erred from the Catholic faith — as the archdeacon clearly asserts in the said canon *A recta*, the Lord saying: "*I have prayed for you, Peter, that your faith may not fail*" (Lk. 22:32) — and thus that saying would be removed from him: that the pope can offend, because, as the word of God is, the universal Church cannot err in faith, and thus

neither can the pontiff together with the sacred college of cardinals, in whom we perceive, hold, believe, and venerate with the constant observance of time the power of the whole Church to be comprised.

XIX. The canon *Quamvis* and the canon *Dudum*, adduced to the contrary, rightly demonstrate the power of the Roman Church. And when you assert that the power of not judging pontiffs by anyone other than the pope, and of not assembling a general council, was defined by the Apostles and the councils — certainly this is not a good argument: this council defines it, therefore it has been made definite by a council. In the definitions of councils are contained both the norms of faith and those things which had been established by the ancients. For the word of wisdom says: "*Do not transgress the boundaries of the Fathers*" (Prov. 22:28), and the teaching of the Apostles also intimates the same. Moreover, faith and dogmas of this kind have been defined through councils — and if anyone were to say they were produced by the councils, he would certainly be saying what is notoriously false. For faith and sacred Scripture are immovable as first principles and admit of no change; the definitions that follow from them do not create anything new, but declare what already exists. And thus these canons intimate that the councils defined these powers of the Roman Church — not as though they were given by the councils, since those same pontiffs assert that the Roman Church obtained its primacy not from men but from God, and not through councils but that by it the councils were established — but rather that they accord with the words of piety and the principles of our faith, as is clearly gathered from all the definitions of the holy councils, by which those things are defined whose contrary could not be accomplished by councils.

You add that one person can sin; it has been answered above that he is not to be believed to sin, since he either finds holiness or produces it; and if as an individual he wished to sin, he is not found to have erred in faith together with his college of cardinals, as has been repeated frequently.

I grant that she is not mistress but mother; but it is the office of fathers to correct erring children without punishment, to favor the good, and even in times of necessity to sell and pledge children — as in the title *De correctione propinquorum* and in the title *De patribus qui filios distraxerunt* (Justinian, C. IX, 65, 1; C. IV, 43, 1). If those subject to her comport themselves as children, there is certainly no

domination; but if as rebels, the more gravely and confidently must they be restrained than even slaves.

XX. And when you add that it is absurd that he should be able to wander with impunity — this, as I have asserted, is not to be believed; and it is more just to judge that what he does operates in right order, than to loosen the reins on subjects against the head and to judge concerning his person — than which nothing more dangerous is seen in the right unity of the Church.

When indeed you bring forward the decision of the Council of Constance, read what has been said above concerning councils and the dogmas of the saints. Do you not know that a sentence against a sentence is by the law itself null? — in the law *l. 1 C. quando provocare* and canon *Inter monasterium de re iudicata* (Justinian, C. VII, 64, 10 = Krueger 326–7; Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. II, t. 17, c. 20 = Friedberg II, 403–5). Lest it contradict the preceding conclusions of the saints, that decision is to be understood in the case where the pope would deviate from the notoriously decided norms in matters of faith, or in the cases in which the dogmas of the aforesaid saints establish that this may be done. But to speak with moderation: what was the zeal of the Baseliers? If you examine their votes in particular, you will perceive no zeal of religion, no zeal of God, no object of the union of the Christian religion — but only the pursuit of private ambitions, the acquisition of private dignities, and the revenge of personal grievances. How much weight these carry in a sentence on faith, judge for yourself. If we rightly consider the words of God, the sayings of the saints, the decrees of the councils, and the expedient course for the Christian religion, there is no one who would not assert that there exists a single head of religion — to protect the faith, to divert schisms, to preserve unity in religion, under whose reverence those subject to him may rest in peace, who may foster the poor, protect the oppressed, uphold the laws — to be necessarily expedient. And if at any time he should conduct himself less prudently than would befit him, given the firmness of the faith, it is more wholesome to await a better outcome under hope of a worthier successor, than under this veil of good to loose the reins to the furies of the ignorant populace — lest this body, so solid, so beautiful, resplendent in the harmony of its members, be brought to confusion. Let us take up the word of our Savior, who says: "*He who is greatest among you shall be your servant*" (Mt. 20:26); "*He who exalts himself shall be humbled, and he who*

humbles himself shall be exalted" (Mt. 23:12) — so that each may be greater than the other in the pursuit of good, and each may have preceded the other in striving to help the other; and thus for all the authorities which speak of sending and of rebuke and of correction, a place will be given in this manner, so that each may be greater than the other.

XXI. If they differ in diversity of conduct, given the firmness of the faith, it is more just for the sentence of God's head to outweigh the sentences of the multitudes — which for the most part slide into various directions through the diversity of their judgments — and that this is more expedient for the unity of the faith and the steadfastness of Christians and the commonwealth of Christians; and even if there were no precepts of God, this is most well known, as Jerome elegantly begins in Book **ii** *Against Jovinian* (Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum*, lib. I, c. 26 = Migne PL 23, 217 A): *"The Church is founded upon Peter. And although the same is done with respect to the other Apostles, one is established as head among the twelve, so that the occasion of schism may be removed."*

Let us inquire into other matters: how many times have the schisms of the Eastern Christians been suppressed by the authority of the Roman See. Let us look upon the foundation of the Christian faith — that from the reverence of that very head, the Emperor Constantine was brought to the faith, and at the exhortation of that head convened the Nicene Synod, where the first cradles of our religion were confirmed. Whatever authority and faith, whatever goods, whatever reverence, whatever propagation there is — you will rightly perceive it all from the head. How would the assembly of councils come to be, unless there were the pontifical compulsion and command of one who would take care — and if several were to take care, would not impediments arise in the course of proceedings, as the canon *Legimus*, D. XCIII testifies (Decretum Gratiani, D. 93, c. 24 = Friedberg I, 327–9), and D. XVI, canon *Hinc est etiam*, D. XIII (Decretum Gratiani, C. 16, q. 1, c. 39 = Friedberg I, 771–2)? Since the Roman Church has never been permitted to be corrupted by the taint of heresy, by the protection of God, for which He professed to have prayed unceasingly — if its authority had not existed, neither the fury of the Arians, nor the blasphemies of Macedonius and Eunomius, nor the errors of Sabellius would have been suppressed — they who had drawn very many in the Eastern regions to their opinions. The authority of the Roman See alone

outweighed all, as Athanasius testifies — who, against the Fathers assembled on the counsel of all the Orientals, the heretics who even presumed to brand him a heretic because he adhered to the Catholic sentence, was protected by the defense of the Roman See, to whose see he appealed from their errors.

What more need be sought in the light, unless it be to conclude that there is one holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church, whose head in human affairs Christ, while on earth, left Peter in his place in humanity, and the other legitimate successors in the Roman See — whom the subscriptions of all councils call the bishop of the Catholic Church, and thus the father of the universal Church commemorates — and that he is the unique bishop of the Catholic Church, whom the records of sacred laws commemorate as the head of religion and the fount of the priesthood.

XXII. LUDOVICUS. You have now professed that the Roman Pontiff ceases to be so if one distinguished by the primacy were to fail in the faith; nor do I think you will deny that, if he were to bring manifest scandal to the Church, he could be restrained by the resistance of the faithful, since this is the opinion of all doctors. Is it not notorious that the Church is scandalized, if Eugenius, the Supreme Pontiff, treats with contempt the Church legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit at Basel — approved by its sentence and decree, and by the very many decrees issued by the Fathers there — spurns it, and has attempted to transfer the council to the city of Ferrara against the resistance of those present there, in order to satisfy his own wishes? What greater scandal or contempt could be offered? What reverence for councils would remain if these things were to pass without remedy? Is it not necessary to say, even by your own words, that he can be restrained by the faithful legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit? For if the faculty of transferring depended on the arbitrary will of the Supreme Pontiff, what else would it be than to be able to divert the judgment of schism or heresy at the pleasure of his will and to arrange it in whatever place he wished — against the law *Non utique*, Digest *De eo qui certo loco* (Justinian, D. XIII, 4, 2, §3 = Mommsen 176)? And from this the faculty of assembly would be removed — against the law *Si legationis*, Digest *De iudiciis* (Justinian, D. V, 1, 25 = Mommsen 74) — especially since he submitted himself to the jurisdiction of the council, which is most well known to be possible, as the law *Est receptum*, Digest *De iurisdictione omnium iudicum* establishes (Justinian, C. III, 13 = Krueger 128); and by mixing himself in any way into those

matters already dismissed by the council, he acts in no way at all, by the canon *Licet de officio delegati* and by the canon *Cum de appellatione* (Sextus decretalium, lib. I, t. 13, c. 2 = Friedberg II, 978), Book VI, q. VI, at which I am astonished. For there are many things which, even if they can be done, once done cannot be revoked. The college of cardinals elects the pontiff, canon *Ubi periculum*, *De electu*, Book VI (Sextus decretalium, lib. I, t. 6, c. 3 = Friedberg II, 946–9); yet they have no cognizance of his removal, as is said of a presbyter in C. XV, q. VII, c. *Episcopus*; and *Inter corporalia, de translatione* (Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. I, t. 7, c. 2 = Friedberg II, 97–8). From all of which it is most well known that I was right to remain at Basel, lest I suffer the holy reverence for councils — which restrains the insolences of the pontiff — to be given over to neglect.

XXIII. ANDREAS. You have encompassed many heads under brief words. By these you argue that the pope cannot transfer a council, and that he can be restrained by the council on account of notorious scandal to the Church, and that the council can discern whether he is a transgressor of the faith or whether he scandalizes the Church. What you have set forth, when rightly examined, will receive an evident refutation.

Who those are who have brought scandal upon the Church, what is to be written below will show more clearly than light; concerning the transfer of the council, accept this brief response.

Among the foremost precepts of the old law are: "*Thou shalt not steal*"; and another: "*Thou shalt not kill*"; another: "*Honor thy parents*"; and another: "*Sanctify the Sabbath*" etc. — which, even though they were composed most perfectly by the mouth of God, the contrary of any one of these is permitted by law when a necessary cause subsists. Necessity, when it could not otherwise be done, permits the goods of another to be taken against the will of the owner — by the word of our Redeemer, *De consecratione*, D. V, *Discipulos* (Decretum Gratiani, *De consecratione*, D. 5, c. 26). For one's own defense, when it cannot otherwise be done, the laws command that the attacker may be slain — in the law *Ut*, Digest *De iustitia et iure* (Justinian, C. VIII, 4, 1 = Krueger 332), and Codex *Unde vi*, l. 1. Prodigal parents may be despised by children and not permitted by them to administer goods — as the law *Imperator*, Digest *Ad Trebellianus* (Justinian, C. VI, 49 = Krueger 278) commands. And if the necessities of the living or a sudden

momentary case should counsel the exercise of certain activities on a feast day, the laws both canonical and civil permit this — *De feriis, Licet* and in the same title *Solet*, and the law *Perlatum*, Digest. Law therefore, however thoroughly digested with counsel, issued from the divine mouth, receives moderation and alteration by reason of imminent necessities or opportune circumstances — as John testifies in the preamble to the Clementines (cf. prooemium Ioannis XXII ad Clementinas = Friedberg II, 1130), and *De haereticis et falsis* at the beginning. Nor could a law be made to prevent a supervening necessary cause from moderating it — *De imperio actus, l. de etate, § ex causa*, professing this in precise terms.

Although therefore the reverence of the prince and the dignity of his primacy are to be esteemed in matters of doubt as conducted by right judgment — and thus none of the aforesaid arguments would proceed which contend against the prince when he comes to the transfer of the council to avoid the scandal or judgment of the council — yet when a notorious cause is present, what need is there to use authorities? The cause of the transfer was this: since it had been agreed with the Greeks who were assembling, that the Supreme Pontiff himself should be personally present at the council, and lest he abandon the patrimony of the Church and the city itself — oppressed by the incursions of tyrants — in its necessity through a long absence, it was necessary to assign the council to a place not distant. For such care must be had for that city lest it fall — as Jerome said in his commentary on Genesis — that just as by the destruction of Jerusalem the primacy of the Jewish priests perished, so by the destruction of the city of Rome danger threatens the Christian priesthood; and more elegantly Lactantius says in the seventh book of the *Divine Institutions*, toward the end of chapter XXV (Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones*, lib. VII, c. 25 = Migne PL 6, 812 B, 815 A), that danger threatens the world if the Roman city should perish, to which the greatest care must be applied. These are his very words: "*The thing itself declares that the fall and ruin of the world will shortly come to pass — which would not seem to be feared, so long as the city of Rome stands inviolate. For when that head of the world shall have fallen, who can doubt that the end has now come for human affairs and for the world? That is the city which still sustains all things. We must pray and adore the God of heaven — if indeed his decrees or will can be delayed — lest some abominable tyrant come who shall destroy that light, in whose destruction the world itself will collapse.*" Was that city — which by the testimony

of such great men must be guarded so particularly for the preservation of the faith — to be abandoned to the fury of the most savage and villainous men? I pass over who sent those savage men, since I might rightly assert that it was by you yourselves — who put forward the Holy Spirit — that they were dispatched for the destruction and demolition of that homeland; as I myself saw and observed noted in the public letters of those most wicked men, whose inferior names I do not write down, lest they gain fame from their crime. This therefore — lest the city itself, besieged by the frenzies of the most wicked men, remain without a head through the long absence of the Supreme Prelate — was the most sufficient cause for transferring the council to a place from which the long absence of its prince would not appear to leave the city without remedy for the ills that beset it.

XXIV. But there is also another most well-known, necessary, and evident cause made plain — concluded with the best outcome — namely the most holy convention of union with the Greeks, who, with accumulated public protestations, declared that they could not proceed to any other places chosen by the Basellers than to a place in Italy to be chosen by the Roman Prelate. Are these causes sufficient for alterations of the laws? Do they not refute every thought against the Roman Prelate, showing that he acted with right judgment? Are these matters ambiguous, which are most well known to the whole world?

But even if he could have rightly sanctioned the transfer by the authority of his pontificate alone — none of your arguments making anything to the contrary — nevertheless the transfer of the council was also made by the judgment of the Fathers who had been at Basel, as I shall clearly show. Nor finally is there any need to be concerned about the Constance decree on transferring a council within the same nation; for it excepts even for that a just cause — war, plague, and certain other not so urgent causes as those which existed in our case. For it had also been unanimously decreed at Basel that the council should be transferred, and into another nation; but the question was about the place to be comprised in the decree. With the opinions of the Fathers divided, and with the voices of those chiefly accruing whose return and arrival was in question, the most holy constitution and decree of the most holy Roman Prelate existed — consonant with law and most fitting to his power — by which he satisfied the opportunity and petition of the Greeks, and chose the place comprised in the decree agreed upon with the Greeks,

at which he himself would personally be present, where the most holy work of union was begun and consummated. That, with the Fathers differing in opinion, the Roman Pontiff is able to adhere to the sentences of the fewer has been handed down by example frequently; the Council of Ariminum and the laws concerning his primacy noted above demonstrate this — especially since it manifestly accords with equity that the sentence of the fewer was more commodious, better, more fitting, and more wholesome for the Greeks, which the pontifical authority confirmed as a conciliar decree.

Nor shall I hear you if you were to fabricate that solemn provision was made by those who had been at Basel for conducting the Greeks to Avignon. First, because this attempt itself — against the protestations of the Greeks made in general consistories, not accepting the Avignonese place as most dangerous to their safety in the voyage — suggested nothing other than that you were diverting them from the good purpose of reunion. Whether this was true, the process of your proceedings intimates — since against the will of the Greeks and the confirmation of pontifical power, and the judgment confirmed by the authority of your own many presiding Fathers — knowing of the constitution of the presiding one and the Fathers adhering to his opinion — the venerable Fathers appointed as legates in the name of the Basellers: Anthony, bishop of Porto in Portugal; Peter, bishop of Digne; and the venerable Nicholas of Cusa, provost of Meinfelt — sent to Greece with the authority of the Basellers and with the approval of the pontiff, to conduct the Greeks. Yet to the contempt of the Christian religion, you dispatched others, who were to require the Greeks against their wishes to come to Avignon. The foremost of the Turks, enemy of the Christian religion, could scarcely have devised anything more harmful, so as to divert this holy work of union. What more disgraceful thing could have been done for the Christian religion than to see two embassies mutually contradictory in the name of the same council, and one of them opposing the head thereof? Is this single example not sufficient to make it clear how expedient and necessary it is for the Christian religion to have one head — lest equal loss or injury be caused to those of contrary opinions —?

But I hold that our Redeemer in his mercy has permitted these things to come to pass so that, to the extent that the contrary operations of men opposing the head —

carried out by you — have been, so to that same extent it would be apparent to all that this holy work of union was accomplished by the work of God.

Whether this makes you tainted with the contagion of heresy, consider: for the sole cause would be that without the pontiff's transfer, the council's authority would have declined from you. For just as we say the head is deprived by the law itself for the crime of heresy, so by no lesser cause, with a council tainted by the stain of heresy, that council would by the law itself lose its authority and it would reside in the head — as occurred in the time of Athanasius in the Eastern regions, where the faith was found only in Athanasius himself, who appealed to the Roman See. Just as we hold that the head can be infected by the contagion of heresy, and thus the rights of the head could reside in the members — so also in the members, given the contagion, it could be argued that all the vigor of the members resides in the head alone; and the whole council, even if general, must be given over as perverted from the faith if the head is removed.

And indeed what our Savior notably said — *"I have prayed for you, Peter"* (Lk. 22:32) — and what the Apostle Paul, who professed to pray unceasingly for the Roman Church (cf. Rom. 1:10), is taken to mean: that it cannot be given that the members with the head, and the head with the members, can decline from the rules of right faith. And thus it has been established by right providence that the members may hold the place of the head in faith, and the head the place of the members — but in all other matters the head obtains the primacy in all things.

XXV. I hold therefore that from these things there can be no complaint about the just existing cause for the transfer of the council — and thus by the transfer of the pontiff alone, in which in matters of doubt no fraud is to be presumed, and with just, well-known, and necessary causes existing, and because with the Fathers not concurring in one spirit, I have judged the council to have been transferred by the authority of that same council by the sentences of the fewer; and because by the stain of heresy, the council's authority, if any existed, regularly left you destitute by the aforesaid causes — the Council of Ferrara represented the one, holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church. And thus since unity does not admit of duplicity, yet you striving to rend the seamless garment (cf. Cyprian, *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate*, c. 7 = CSEL ed. Hartel, 215), I have judged you to be wanderers from the unity of the Church.

From these things also we rightly gather who brought scandal upon the Church. You imposed tithes upon the churches; you sold indulgences at an appraised price; all bonds of divine and human law were relaxed under the power of the Holy Spirit, which you asserted to be above the law — not considering that the same spirit, by the same mouth of God, always thinks rightly and does not in any way oppose its own decisions, and that the same spirit is attested by divine Scripture. Since it seemed by the work of the spirit that the spirit is not one — and if it is one, that it could at one time do the contrary of what it had once done — which would happen if it were to assent to the appetites of the Baseliers? For where is it written that in the invocation of the same Holy Spirit in the celebration of Mass, there should be a concurrence toward two contrary decrees invoking the same spirit — where does the head, by the work of the spirit, never dissent from the members? Is there spirit where men with an assessed price render judgments by particular ambition or at the command of parents, where they intend nothing other than to suppress the head — which the dogmas of the saints demonstrate must be protected by all the members, after the example of the serpent?

XXVI. These deeds of the Baseliers were to be abhorred by the whole world. Give testimony yourself concerning these things, you who were present, whether what I profess is true. But with the power of the pontiff and the transfer of the council set aside, he who desires to judge rightly about individual matters must be empty of anger, hatred, and ambition — as Sallust testifies (Sallust, *Bellum Catilinarium*, c. 51), and in the canon *Si igitur, de electione*. If one were to posit depraved Fathers of the council, no one would hesitate that they must be punished by the head; if however the depravity of the pontiff were established, and the Fathers gathered in council with good zeal, I should perceive the whole world concurring with one zeal of faith like one man — then perhaps there would be a place for the authorities. But in matters of doubt, the unity in the head is clear, the diversity in multiplicity is clear. It is clear that the head cannot desire greater dignity; but the diversity of the many — who it is most well known are inclined to strive for the desires of dignities — strives for novelties in order to satisfy their wishes, novelties which furnish causes for dignities. It is clear that the head is of freer judgment from the oppression of secular powers; but the multitude, for the most part, must necessarily comply with the voices of secular men. From all of which it is most well known that, even if there were no precept of our Redeemer, in matters of doubt one

summit and head of clerics is most abundantly expedient for the union of the Church, for the advancement of the members, for the relief of the oppressed, and for the propagation of the Church.

Those who declare the pontiff criminal — let them also set equal conditions and a criminal mob, which by the reasons set out above is rather oppressed by vices and ambition, and would more likely cause excesses in that direction. Certainly given this, there will be no authority in a mob corrupted by the vice of crime. For the vice of one person is suppressed by a small satisfaction for vices; but the vices of a mob would disrupt every human assembly. If however we posit an excellent head and excellent members — as the philosopher teaches must be done in any right comparison, saying in the first book of the *Politics* (Aristotle, *Politica*, lib. I, c. 5, n. 1; cf. I, c. 2, n. 12): *"in a comparison of two, the subjects ought to be taken as well disposed; otherwise it would easily be shown that feminine rule is to be preferred to the principate of a man not rightly disposed"* — so in this comparison of pontiff and council, with the subjects posited as well disposed, no one would make it doubtful that individuals ought spontaneously to obey the most wholesome head. But in matters of doubt, as I have related, one must rather decide in favor of the head. These things I have brought forward in order to give you occasion for words, willingly submitting them to the doctrines of all those who think more rightly and to the norms of holy mother Church.

LUDOVICUS. Many most wholesome works were accomplished at Basel, of which you ought to have made mention. Was not the reduction of the Bohemians a most necessary work of the Christian faith, and manifestly so?

ANDREAS. What was done before the time of the formulation of our accusation does not bear upon the subject of our question; but indeed the reduction of the Greeks, brought about from the Ferrarese translation, concludes all that has been said by us — so that the transfer itself appears rightly made.

LUDOVICUS. Many things have been written by many persons on the power of the council; lest we be seen to oppose one another in some judgment, let us leave these matters to the judgment of others. But I cannot deny that this reunion brought about from your council of Ferrara is most excellent, pious, and holy for the followers of the faith of Christ; and since I would most willingly have been present

to see the new developments, I ask that you recount in order what was transacted by the Greeks together with you.

ANDREAS. Let these matters suffice as discussed in today's disputation. Tomorrow you shall meet here in this place, and you will learn each of the events in order.

LUDOVICUS. Agreed. I ask that you return tomorrow.

ANDREAS. I will do so. Farewell.

LUDOVICUS. And you farewell.

[*Manuscript and editorial notes:*]

1: after *igitur* there is a blank space for 3–4 brief words in the manuscript. — 1: cf. Sallust, *Bellum Catilinarium*, c. 51. — 4: *primatu insignitus cura deficeret* V. — 5: *congregata* V. — 7: *iuxtam* V; *guerra, peste* V. — 11: *aliud* V. — 12: Justinian, D. XIII, 4, 2, §3 (*Non utique*) = Mommsen 176; *titulus: De eo quod certo loco dari oporteat*. — 13: Justinian, D. V, 1, 25 (*Si legationis*) = Mommsen 74. — 14: Justinian, C. III, 13 = Krueger 128. — 16: Sextus decretalium, lib. I, t. 13, c. 2 (*Licet*) = Friedberg II, 978. — 18: Sextus decretalium, lib. I, t. 6, c. 3 (*Ubi periculum*) = Friedberg II, 946–9. — 20: Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. I, t. 7, c. 2 (*Inter corporalia*) = Friedberg II, 97–8. — 25: Decretum Gratiani, D. 93, c. 24 (*Legimus*) = Friedberg I, 327–9; Decretum Gratiani, C. 16, q. 1, c. 39 (*Hinc est etiam*) = Friedberg I, 771–2. — 26: Basilientium V. — 27: before I. the name Marcus was written but deleted; the author certainly did not know the name of the bishop, who was not I(oannes) but Petrus; after *prepositum* 4 dots in V; probably to be supplied *de Meinfelt*. — 28: cf. bull of Eugenius IV of 30 May 1437, Ep. pontif. I, n. 66, pp. 65–70. — 29: *non* V; the opposing party of the Basel synodals sent to Constantinople at roughly the same time bishops Ludovicus Visensis and Ioannes Lausanensis, with whom Ioannes de Ragusio O.P. was associated, already residing in Constantinople from a prior legation of the Basel council. — 33: also in these words the unity of the preceding treatise with the description of the acts of the Council of Ferrara-Florence is evident. — 35: Graecorum protestatio of 15 February 1437, in Ep. pontif. I, n. 66, pp. 66–8. — Note on the Council of Ariminum (Rimini) of the year 359. — 14: Lk. 22:32; cf. Rom. 1:10. — 25: cf.

Cyprian, *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate*, c. 7 = CSEL ed. Hartel, 215. — 15: Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum*, lib. I, c. 26 = Migne PL 23, 217 A. — 17: Aristotle, *Politica*, lib. I, c. 5, n. 1 = Didot I, 494 (allusion); cf. I, c. 2, n. 12 = Didot I, 486.

PUBLIC COLLOQUIA OF FERRARA

Preface

ANDREAS. When I was committing to writing, in the intervals left over from legal business, those matters worthy of record that have occurred in our time — compiling a daily journal of the curia into a book — and was meditating among common entries the assembly of the Greeks and the reasons for their coming, I perceived that it was not fitting to mix a matter differing from common things in subject, manner, and persons. For the subject is one of faith; the manner is that of an assembly into one ecumenical synod of men of diverse regions and enclosures; the persons are those of the Supreme Pontiff, the great Eugenius, and the most sacred senate and college of cardinals of the general synod, and of the most illustrious Greek Emperor John Palaeologus and the most reverend Joseph, Patriarch of Constantinople — than whom, both in subject, manner, and dignity of persons, nothing more excellent is given. Moved by this, I conceived in my mind to record these things for myself in a particular treatise; and now I am prompted to bring it into act, drawn by your inquiry, so that you may know that the cause for the transfer of the council was necessary and beneficial — and since you were absent from all these events, when you reflect upon how maturely and religiously everything proceeded, I have no doubt that you will judge detestable those who were an obstacle to so holy a work. Coming therefore to the matter itself with the protection of God, let me not weary of recounting what you the day before yesterday were eager to learn from me.

LUDOVICUS. We conferred many things in mutual exchange in our previous discussion, in which we spent the day — you attacking the deeds of the Baseliers, and I detesting with good reason those things that were done to their diminishment — and we gave an end to our words, concluding with equal resolve that this at least we cannot deny: that what you most diligently contested with the Greeks in your council of Ferrara and Florence is to be extolled with the highest praise and commendation; and since it is reported that the Latins and Greeks assembled so

gravely and religiously, and disputed so thoroughly, I feel the greatest desire to learn from you — who were present at these assemblies — what was transacted there.

ANDREAS. I shall recount it no less willingly than you desire; for the assemblies were admirable — with each side striving separately until the darkness of night, in equal alternation of words, with the Supreme Pontiff and all the Fathers of the Latins and Greeks present, twelve persons contending in debate on the faith — six from the side of the Latins and the same number from the Greeks — under a single interpreter.

LUDOVICUS. Please recount from the beginning: when the Emperor and the Greek Fathers came to port, and what they publicly transacted with you. And I ask that you omit nothing worthy of recounting from the report. But before you come to the manner of the arrival — was the cause of their coming, as we believe, that they might be converted?

ANDREAS. I do not know what inner movement of the parties there was; but the common opinion holds that the cause of the coming was that there might be one fold and one shepherd of religion, as is established among the foremost precepts of our religion. For in many things they were diverging from the holy Roman Church, even to the knowledge of the Deity itself; and since the causes of the differences will become known from what is to be written below, we do not set them down here.

LUDOVICUS. Who do you think gave rise to this affair?

ANDREAS. It is not my concern to inquire who gave rise to their assembling. There are those who — as you too assert and as we debated the day before — think that the Fathers who had gathered at Basel for the universal synod gave rise to it; while others think it was the Supreme Pontiff Eugenius, who even when he was in minor orders burned with this as his supreme desire. Even if you assert that both together, by mutual concurrence, solemnly dispatched a fleet, men, and money to carry the Greeks, I have nonetheless learned by trustworthy report that, even though those who had been at Basel sent triremes, they did so not in order to bring the Greeks, but to dissuade them from coming — which is perceived by a certain

argument: since they brought neither crossbowmen to be left in Constantinople nor money with them; indeed it is reported that they pressed strongly that the power of the infidels might obstruct the Greeks in making their way to the Supreme Pontiff. Even if I can scarcely believe these things could have been conceived by the minds of the faithful, I learned them by trustworthy report from those who were present at all those events. But if this concurrence had come from fervor of faith, each side would have been worthy of memory.

LUDOVICUS. Why did they come in the pontiff's triremes rather than those of the Baseliers?

ANDREAS. I learned that, since they had also promised to come and, considering the end of their undertaking — toward which they were tending, namely that under one shepherd they might know God — they resolved to cross in the fleet of the Roman Pontiff, in whom the power of the universal Church principally resides, spurning the ships of the Baseliers; they could not give their assent to two parties contending over an individual matter.

LUDOVICUS. Please recount the manner of the arrival.

ANDREAS. I will do so most willingly, and I shall take my beginning from the moment of their arrival at Venice, so as not to prolong the matter too far. In the previous discussion, while I was arguing strongly against the Baseliers, we recounted what the Supreme Pontiff and the Baseliers did in the dispatch of ships, and what was accomplished in the city of Constantinople by the legates of each side and the fleets of each legation. On the ninth day of February, in the year one thousand four hundred and thirty-eight, the Greeks were received at Venice with great ringing of bells, with the Doge and the citizens presiding over the Venetian lordship going out to meet them in the ship they call the Bucentaur, into which, with the Emperor received, they conducted him to the palace prepared for him. They were coming, as was asserted, with all cruelty and obstinacy set aside, in order to know the truth — and it was rightly a matter for rejoicing.

LUDOVICUS. Was there anyone from our side to receive them?

ANDREAS. If we consider the honor of the Westerners, were they not magnificently received, when they saw the people of so great a city applauding their arrival?

LUDOVICUS. But did the Supreme Pontiff and those who were at Ferrara for the council not send anyone?

ANDREAS. The Supreme Pontiff Eugenius, upon hearing of the arrival of the Greeks, sent to Venice the most reverend Cardinal of Santa Croce and the Marquis of Ferrara to receive the Greeks. But also the most reverend Lord Cardinal of Santa Sabina, surnamed of Sant'Angelo — who had presided over the Basel Council and who had asserted that he had above all protected that assembly so as to give occasion to the union of the Greeks — upon learning that the Greeks had come in the pontiff's fleet, came from Basel to Venice shortly after the arrival of the aforesaid cardinal and marquis.

LUDOVICUS. What did the Greeks do after disembarking from the ships?

ANDREAS. The Emperor and the Patriarch of the Greeks, at their first entry from Venice to the Supreme Pontiff, dispatched orators — three laymen and two abbots — who arrived at the pontiff on the twentieth of March, having been granted license to speak publicly. The laymen, as was fitting, genuflected before the Supreme Pontiff on approaching him; the clergy, however, with bowed head, showed no other reverence. They explained that the Emperor and the Patriarch had come at the nod of his Holiness and would come very soon, after a rest from their long journey.

LUDOVICUS. And then?

ANDREAS. With the Greeks dismissed at Venice, the most reverend Lord Cardinal of Santa Croce and the Marquis returned to Ferrara; the Cardinal of Santa Sabina returned to Mantua.

LUDOVICUS. Please continue — what followed next?

ANDREAS. On the fourth of March, the Emperor of the Greeks entered Ferrara with a great display of horsemen. All the cardinals who were then at Ferrara came

out to meet him outside the city with a great retinue of prelates; he was conducted under a golden canopy to the apostolic palace, and on horseback all the way to the pope's chamber, by a road established for this purpose in the Ferrarese palace by the marquises of old; and having rendered the reverence due to the Roman Pontiff, he was escorted with like pomp to the palace called Paradise, arranged for his residence.

LUDOVICUS. Did the Patriarch also follow the Emperor?

ANDREAS. The Patriarch had remained behind, coming by water, being too advanced in age.

LUDOVICUS. Did he delay some time longer?

ANDREAS. On the eighth of the same month he arrived with his company of clergy, coming by ship on the Po. As he was approaching the city — and when a great assembly of archbishops and bishops and other members of the curia had gone outside the city to receive him and had waited for him quite some time — the Marquis of Ferrara and his son going to him at the ship in which he had come, it was discovered that he wished the cardinals of the holy Roman Church to come out to meet him. With this remaining in force that day, he did not descend from the ship in which he had come, and spent the night there.

LUDOVICUS. In the ship?

ANDREAS. In the ship; for it was surrounded on all sides with planks and tapestries — what they call a Bucentaur — arranged for similar occasions.

LUDOVICUS. In what order did he finally come ashore?

ANDREAS. At the dawn of the following day, members of the curia having been summoned by special messenger to the port where the ships put in at Ferrara, each member of the curia came on horseback; and two junior cardinal deacons — Prospero di Colonna of the title of San Giorgio in Velabro and the Firmanus of Santa Maria in Via Lata — likewise came by order of the pontiff. As the Patriarch and the other Greeks rode out, the cardinals came to meet them, without any mutual inclination being made, nor did either side doff their cap to the other. Lord

Colonna, who of the two was younger in age but greater in rank by virtue of prior attainment of dignity, said thus to the Patriarch: *"Most reverend Father, our lord the pope has sent us to accompany your paternity"* — and taking him between them, they conducted him to the apostolic palace.

LUDOVICUS. How was he received by the Supreme Pontiff?

ANDREAS. The pope did not come out to meet him in public; indeed, beyond his customary manner, he remained in a private chamber of his private apartment — I believe out of regard for the aforementioned difficulty. The Patriarch entered accompanied by only six persons, the pope having arranged likewise to have as many with him if he wished, besides the cardinals. The Supreme Pontiff sat until the arrival of the Patriarch in a private chamber, with the cardinals arranged in consistorial fashion to the right of the pope; on a footstool placed to the left, the Patriarch was received. And after he had addressed the Supreme Pontiff briefly, all those who had come with him from the ship — except the cardinals — escorted him to the palace assigned to him as his dwelling.

LUDOVICUS. What followed?

ANDREAS. Since the advanced age of the person and the diversity of ceremonies did not make easy the access of the Patriarch to the Supreme Pontiff, two cardinals were appointed: Lord Cardinal of Santa Sabina, surnamed of Sant'Angelo — who in those days had come from Mantua to the Supreme Pontiff, having laid down the legatine office over which he had presided — and Lord Firmanus, of whom we spoke above. To these it was charged to arrange with the Patriarch the manner and form of the proceedings; and after many negotiations had been held on both sides, they agreed that in the cathedral church of Ferrara, with the Latins and Greeks assembling, it would be declared by the Supreme Pontiff — with the consent of the Greeks — that the ecumenical council was legitimately congregated there.

LUDOVICUS. In what order was this done?

ANDREAS. On the eighth of April, the order was given in the principal church. Seats had been arranged beforehand in the middle of the church of Ferrara for the general council. The right part of the church, where the seat of the Supreme Pontiff is, was arranged for the Latins; the left for the Greeks. Between the tribunal of the

pope and the cardinals of the holy Roman Church, a seat had been arranged for the Roman Emperor, even though absent. There followed the senate of the most reverend cardinals of the holy Roman Church: the most reverend Cardinal de Ursinis, first bishop of Sabina, Jordan by name; Lord Antonio, bishop of Ostia; Branda, of Porto; Pietro of the title of San Marcello; Nicolò of the title of Santa Croce; Francesco of the title of San Clemente; Angelotto of San Marco — these were cardinal presbyters; Prospero of the title of San Giorgio in Velabro; Domenico of Santa Maria in Via Lata — these were cardinal deacons of the holy Roman Church. Between the first and second of the cardinal bishops sat the Patriarch of Jerusalem, whom the holy Roman Church held as patriarch; after the order of the most reverend cardinals followed the most reverend Patriarch of Grado; then the archbishops in the order of their seniority of dignity; after the archbishops the bishops; after the bishops the abbots followed in equal order.

LUDOVICUS. How many of the Latin Fathers were seated in miters?

ANDREAS. One hundred and sixty.

LUDOVICUS. What was the attire of all the aforesaid?

ANDREAS. The Supreme Pontiff was present in a jeweled miter and vested in sacred vestments; similarly, the cardinal bishops and presbyters standing with miters removed had only albs without ornament; the cardinal deacons were in deacons' vestments and white miters; and the other patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops were seated in the manner of cardinal bishops with their ornaments; the protonotaries and the corrector were placed on a footstool set crosswise through the church from the right side to the left side of the church; and we advocates were placed in our order at their feet at the top of the steps; the auditors and clerks of the camera remained near the ground at the feet of the pontiff. Such was the number, order, and form of the Latins in the aforesaid assembly; and in the absence of the Greeks, Mass was solemnly celebrated of the Holy Spirit; and with the observances customarily kept in public sessions maintained, the Supreme Pontiff and the Latin Fathers standing on the right part of the church, the Greeks arrived and were received on the left part of the church arranged for them.

LUDOVICUS. What place had been assigned to the Greek Emperor?

ANDREAS. On the left side, directly opposite the throne of the Roman Emperor, a seat had been similarly arranged. To his right, on a certain footstool placed there, was Demetrius, brother of the same Emperor, Despot of the Morea.

LUDOVICUS. Continue with the order of the clergy.

ANDREAS. Opposite the first cardinal, a seat had been arranged for the Patriarch, who was not present that day due to illness and sent a special mandate, which was publicly read, and which I shall insert below word for word. In the four footstools arranged after the Patriarch's place, there followed: the Archbishop of Heraclea, who held the legitimate mandate of the Patriarch of Alexandria and acted as his representative; the Archbishop of Ephesus, legate of the Patriarch of Antioch; the Archbishop of Monemvasia, representing the person of the Patriarch of Jerusalem; the Metropolitan of Iberia, apocrisarius of the King of Iberia; and the Archbishop of Trebizond, the Archbishop of Rhizaion, the Archbishop of Nicaea, the Archbishop of Lacedaemon, the Archbishop of Nicomedia, the Archbishop of Turnovo, the Archbishop of Amaseia, the Archbishop of Mytilene, the Archbishop of Tolosonensis, the Archbishop of Stauropolis, the Archbishop of Distria, the Archbishop of Gania, the Archbishop of Melenik, the Archbishop of Anchialos, the Archbishop called Muldimanus — all archbishops; after whose assembly there were six persons wearing the habit of presbyters, metropolitans of the church of Constantinople called cruciferi, from the fact that they carried a cross above their cap beyond the common habit of presbyters; and the venerable company of monks followed in their order.

LUDOVICUS. What was the habit of the Patriarch and the other archbishops?

ANDREAS. We saw there the habit of the Patriarch, archbishops, and bishops to be black, with a covering placed on the head in the manner of monks, a cope of celestial color, varied with white and purple stripes running crosswise from top to bottom; and they wore on the middle of their breast a kind of reliquary containing the venerable sign of the cross and certain relics of the saints.

LUDOVICUS. What was the attire of the religious?

ANDREAS. The abbots and monks wore copes made of camels' hair or gray wool, with a head covering not in any way differing from that of their patriarchs or bishops.

[*Manuscript and editorial notes:*]

1: Andreas de Sancta Cruce, author of this work, was an advocate of the pontifical consistory. — 5: cf. Gill, pp. 60–83. — 6: septorum: this word *septum* means barrier, enclosure (Gaffiot); Giustiniani arbitrarily altered it to *sectarum*. — 7: Palliologo V. — 8: cf. Gill, pp. 85–99. — 13: exetrandos tensebis V (read: *execrandos censebis*). — 14: appetabas V. — 16: *pristino sermone*, namely the preceding treatise or dialogue on the Primacy. — 18: deterrentis V. — 20: turiosissime V. — 20: the Council of Basel, of the minority party, and the pope. — 22: quousque: *que* with a line above. — 23: fatiam V. — 24: Basiliensium V. — 26: milleno quadringenteno V. — 27: presedentibus V. — 28: bucentaurum V. — 29: expected perhaps *credulitatis* instead of *crudelitatis*. — 30: pertintaia V. — 32: cf. Jn. 10:16. — 35: cf. Gill, p. 92. — 36: Nicolaus Albergati, cardinal; Nicolaus, Marquis of Este of Ferrara. — 38: Giuliano Cesarini, cardinal. — 1: Trebal. V. — 4: detertavimus V. — 5: Basilientium V. — 7: anhellavit V. — 8: pertepi V. — 10: extogitari V. — 12: cf. Gill, pp. 60–83. — 13: cf. Gill, pp. 60–83. — 14: ktredali ecclesia V. — 15: lege Heracliensis Alexandrini. — 16: lege Ephesinus Antiocheni, Monembasiensis. — 17: Ierosolymitani V; the name of the Metropolitan of Iberia is not known to the editor; he did not subscribe the bull of union of the Greeks. — 18: Dorotheus, metropolitan of Trebizond. — 19: Macarius, metropolitan of Nicomedia; Ignatius, metropolitan of Turnovo; lege Nicomediensis, Turnoviensis, Amasiensis. — 19: Joasaph, metropolitan of Amaseia; Dorotheus, metropolitan of Mytilene. — 20: what the author intended by *Tolosonensis* is unknown; perhaps *Colossensis* is hidden there. — 21: Isaiah, metropolitan of Stauropolis; metropolitans Callistus of Silistria, Gennadius of Gania, Matthew of Melenik, Sophronius of Anchialos, Nathanael of Rhodes (*Colossensis*, distinct however from the Latin archbishop), Damianus Muldimanus (of Moldowallachia). — 22: four clerks of Hagia Sophia subscribed the bull of union of the Greeks, namely: Theodore Xanthopulos, Michael Balsamon, Silvester Syropulos, George Cappadox; *pilleum* V. — 23: monachorum V. — 24: Jordan de Orsini, Antonius

Correr. — 25: Branda de Castiglione; instead of Petrus should be said Antonio (Casinus); Nicolaus Albergati, Francesco Condulmer; Angelotto Fusco, Prospero Colonna. — 26: Domenico Capranica. — 27: Blasius Molino, Latin patriarch. — 27: cardinalis V. — 28: Marcus Condulmer, Latin patriarch. — 29: Hostiensis V. — 35: Ierosolimitanus V. — 38: Octavo V. — 39: cf. Gill, pp. 111–133. — 5: sinixtram V. — 5: alloquto V. — 8: ktedre V. — 12: Patriarch of the Greeks: Joseph II of Constantinople. — 12: cf. Gill, pp. 129–133. — 13: the mandate in the Greek text is not preserved. — 15: Antonius, metropolitan of Heraclea. — 16: Dositheus, metropolitan [of Ephesus]; lege Ephesinus. — 17: Ierosolymitani V. — 18: Metrophanes, metropolitan of Cyzicus, later made Patriarch of Constantinople; Bessarion, metropolitan of Nicaea; Methodius, metropolitan of Lacedaemon. — 20: Tolosonensis: what the author means by this name the editor does not know. — 21: lege Distriensis, Ganiensis, Melenicensis, Anchialensis. — 22: quattuor clerici V. — 27: monacorum V.

Conciliar Session, 9 (8) October 1438

On the ninth day, an assembly was held so that public disputations might take place; and with similar rite and order as I described in the cathedral church, with seats arranged in the great chapel of the apostolic palace, the Supreme Pontiff together with the venerable company of the Latins assembled, as did the Emperor and the Patriarch with the retinue of the Greeks.

LUDOVICUS. I hear of a thing wonderful both to say and to hear — that a cause of faith is being brought into contention, which indeed could not have undergone change by the common assent of all who had been present at this assembly. But of these things I shall speak at another time — whether it was rightly done that the Greeks were admitted to come to an equal disputation of the faith; since perhaps they ought only to have been invited to receive our dogmas and the faithful instructions which the universal Roman Church — which *"has never been tainted by any contagion of heresy"* (cf. Letter of Pope Agatho to Emperor Constantine IV: Mansi 11, 241 B–D) nor is permitted to be corrupted — teaches and holds, by the word of God and of Paul, who professed always to pray unceasingly for her (cf. Col. 1:9; 2 Thess. 1:11) — and solely on these terms perhaps ought to have been

invited to the banquet. But let no word be said of these things now. Tell me, I ask, by whose agency were matters of such great importance brought into the open. I know that certain persons had to be appointed, as I understood from your words to have been done, to take on the burden of the disputation on either side. For in this lies the excellence of intellectual matters: that in bodily contests the bodies of all are of assistance, but in intellectual ones, the small number — though outstanding — of men of vigorous spirit and distinguished veneration is what counts.

ANDREAS. I said six were appointed on each side.

LUDOVICUS. Who from our side?

ANDREAS. The most reverend Lord Cardinal of Santa Sabina, surnamed of Sant'Angelo; Lord Archbishop of Colocensis of the Order of Preachers; Lord Bishop of Forlì of the Order of Friars Minor; Lord Provincial of Lombardy of the Order of Preachers; Lord Pietro Perquerii, master of the sacred page of the Order of Friars Minor; and Lord Giovanni de Sancto Thoma of the Order of Hermits.

LUDOVICUS. And from the Greeks?

ANDREAS. Lord Mark, Archbishop of Ephesus; Lord Metropolitan of Russia; Lord Archbishop of Nicaea — young in age, but venerable in learning and gravity; a certain layman; and two *cruciferi* of Hagia Sophia, whom they call cardinals.

LUDOVICUS. Of the Metropolitan of Russia I now hear for the first time. Why has no word been spoken of him until now?

ANDREAS. I could not indeed speak of him at the time of the Patriarch's arrival, since he had not come with him; but he came by land from the regions of Poland with a great retinue of horsemen and at great expense, entered Ferrara in the month of August — and thus we were not in a position to speak of him pertinently until now.

LUDOVICUS. O holiness of faith and indissoluble bond of the divine, which gathers and binds into one those separated by so great a diversity of lands! But I do not cease to marvel at this: that the Greek peoples, oppressed by the incursions of the Turks, were able to meet such great expenses.

ANDREAS. Cease to marvel, since the Supreme Pontiff conducted them at the proper expense of the Roman Church and of its revenues, and having promised to defray their expenses for as long as they remained in these matters with goodwill, he fulfilled this in deed.

LUDOVICUS. In what order did this contest begin?

ANDREAS. With two seats in the middle of the chapel facing toward the altar — our six opposite them, and the six Greeks seated in their order — one of the Greeks, the man of Nicaea, offered an opening address in the Greek tongue, thereafter translated by the interpreter into Latin in these words.

[*Manuscript and editorial notes:*]

3: *sexione* V. — 5: *ottavo* V. — 9: *ottobris* V. — 9: *ottavam* V. — 13: Iulianus Cesarini. — 13: Andreas Chrysoberges O.P., Archbishop of Colocensis, of the family of Montenero in the city of Genoa, O.P. — 14: Ludovicus de Pirano O.F.M., bishop of Forlì (Foroliviensis). — 15: Ioannes de... — 19: Marcus Eugenicus, metropolitan of Ephesus. — 19: Isidorus, metropolitan of Kiev, and Bessarion of Nicaea, who were created cardinals on 18 December 1439. — 20: the secular person was Georgius Gemistus, and the two clerks of Hagia Sophia were Theodorus Xanthopulos and Michael Balsamon. — 24: cf. Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. — 27: *inexolubile* V. — 29: The apostolic palace was in the castle of Ferrara. — 29: *ktedrali* V. — 17: Concerning these congresses, documents have been edited by H.E. Ludovico Petit in *Documenta relatifs au Concile de Florence*, I, *La question du Purgatoire à Ferrare* (Graffin-Nau, *Patrologia Orientalis*, XV), Paris 1920, and by G. Hofmann S.J. in *Concilium Florentinum*, I and ii (*Orientalia Christiana*, XVI, 3 and XVII, 2), Rome 1929–30; cf. also the article by E. Candal S.J., *Processus discussionis de Novissimis in Concilio Florentino* (*Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, XIX [1953]), pp. 303–349.

SPEECH OF THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF NICAEA

Not only are those who have labored on their own behalf accustomed to rejoice when the conclusions of the greatest matters have proceeded according to their wishes, but equally so when the very beginnings are at hand; for the beginning is necessarily of the greatest importance in all other things as well, since by the common opinion of all the wise it is called the half of the whole. For it is far easier, once the beginning has been given, to proceed to the end than to touch upon it at all if we wish to be idle. But above all in the present divine work, the greatest hope is to be placed, and we must consider to what good end it tends — both because, trusting in the divine promise by which hope is given that we shall have God in our midst (cf. Mt. 18:20), in whose presence nothing at all is beyond hope, and also because we esteem that which has already been accomplished as a great argument of things to come. For so long a time have the members of the Church been divided from one another that they not only did not permit themselves to meet, but even found the very hearing of it most burdensome. But now such great readiness has been shown on both sides that, although there were very many obstacles, all having been overcome, we have come to the place from which the straight path leads to union. Who would not ascribe this to divine power and hence place a favorable omen upon all things?

For this day is a day of joy, and it is lawful for us to exult rejoicing in spirit. Truly splendid are the beginnings of the most splendid conclusions, and great are the first-fruits of the greatest harvests. The machinations of the enemy and the snare he wove against us — when he provoked us, friends and brothers, indeed members and parts of the same head and flock of the same shepherd, to fight against one another — are now beginning to vanish and dissolve. And so those things which were separated are hastening toward the same union, and those which were at variance toward conjunction, since both sides wish and desire above all to be contained under the same corner. Indeed both have met with equal intention and the same purpose — that it may by no means be permitted that one simply seeks to conquer or to be conquered. For this would not befit the disciples of Christ nor men of moderation, but rather certain contentious persons and those who would wish to arrogate all things to themselves and to their own wills; whereas those who desire

only to find the truth, with which even to be overcome they would suffer, and without which to conquer they would consider worthy of rejection.

Wherefore it is necessary that the truth should now shine forth clearly, and that those things which were in some way an impediment to it having been altogether stilled, it should hold dominion over all; and at last falsehood must be driven far from the souls of all — which, when brought alongside the sons of lying, dominates even those who speak most of the father of lying and do and say all things with him as their guide. What fitting word could anyone say to this matter? What at last could be put beside the present events? Let us all therefore rejoice in spirit; let all be concerned with the praises of the Savior, both giving thanks to Him for the things already accomplished and imploring Him to see the end that befits a beginning of this kind. Furthermore let each one of us offer all things that are possible to him and that lead to the end and the sacred union of Christians. All things must be taken up by us, all things attempted, failing in no degree of zeal or readiness or contest or labor. Let us be mindful that it is necessary not only to pray, but also to comply ourselves with God; for not all things are to be hoped from the supreme power while we ourselves do nothing. This would certainly be contrary to those things for which we pray, if we beseech God as our helper while we ourselves apply nothing of our own faculty that is worth the effort and by which God may assist us. For in this way we shall have Him on our side as our aid and shall proceed to the end more easily and prosperously.

Would that this might come to pass, O God our Savior, that standing before you on that day we might sing with applause the hymn of victory and joy — driven by one and the same spirit and rendering the same melody, and also joined in the same chain under you, one and the same head, we might be able to live, move, and breathe; thinking the same things, professing the same things, and being the same toward one another (cf. Rom. 12:16). O Christ the King, you alone over us — one and the same King — we both will and desire; by whose precious blood we have been redeemed, who for us sold under sin and for our redemption delivered yourself. Make therefore that we both be one fold for you, nor suffer your own to be divided, nor permit them to contend with one another; indeed do not abandon the one side, while giving aid to the other — for yourself you delivered up for both, the shedding of your precious blood has become a common washing for both.

Therefore also now give your aid to us and apply yourself to both sides; at last drawing us both to yourself, establish yourself as the one and the same end, so that we may be joined in mutual bond and affection and you may not permit us to be torn apart and at variance with one another, nor consequently that one side of necessity swerve from the proposed end.

O Holy Spirit, who art the fount of graces, spirit of wisdom, spirit of understanding, spirit of the fear of God — for whose sake and with whom this proposed contest of the churches is — drive from us every proud thought, and instill altogether the fear of our God into our souls; grant us understanding and wisdom, and yourself conducting this contest with us — which is fought for your sake — declare the truth to all; since you are not only called the spirit of truth, but also because it is your work that we may be taught all truth, according to that true and irrefutable word of truth (cf. Jn. 16:13).

O God of the Trinity, who hast brought forth all things by ineffable reasons and who containest and providest and governest all things — your work is man, placed perhaps after all other things yet above all visible things; for he had this beginning, and I think a royal one, that with goods prepared and set before him he should then enter into life; of his bodily things, that is, and those conducive to his present life, you have always been provident — and already no less of those things which regard the state and perfection of the soul, whose proper good is truth and that it should not err concerning what is opportune; since this is better and more divine than all things we have and shall have — this grant us at present and bestow upon us, that truth itself may be with us and that we may embrace it with certainty, with pardon given to us if in anything we err in it involuntarily, and especially in the arguments that have been put forward; since not only are you yourself unsearchable and inscrutable, but you also conceal many things from your creatures, whatever faint resonances and quasi-shadows and images of your divine image they are. Grant therefore to us who beseech you and who follow that way with you as our guide which leads to you, the one true God — just as you, although you are threefold in persons, yet save one and the same substance and nature, with no number of persons standing in the way of this identity — so also show us, although we are many and of diverse nations, and moreover through the enemy as sower — alas for me — of diverse opinion and faith, yet to be one and the same in

faith and in the opinion which is of you, this difference being wholly removed; so that we may be one and may think the same concerning you (cf. Jn. 17:11), with neither the variety of nations, nor the number of bodies, nor the multitude standing in the way.

To these things, thus to be concluded: but what say you, who constitute this sacred council and are the authors of these affairs? Since you labor greatly, and moreover pray most frequently and earnestly to see this day — as it is both the herald of things to come and the most excellent beginning and end of those same things of that day — who shall be able to honor you worthily? Who at last to praise you fittingly, when you behold the fruits of your labors blossoming?

Most blessed Father — now indeed you are most blessed, and yet more shall you be when with God as our guide we arrive at the end to which He directs us. Many rewards shall be prepared for you by God; if you unite to yourself the whole holy Church, you will accomplish the greatest work; if you shall persevere and suffer all scandals to be removed from the midst, and in their place to introduce peace and concord — you have shown very much zeal, much solicitude, very much vigilance and care, that the sons of Christ might be gathered from every side and might come together to discuss simultaneously and fraternally and spiritually toward the same end, with truth victorious. No one shall say otherwise; all shall know this. I and all are your witnesses; and it is fitting that you look to the end and provide for the ordering and accomplishment of that, so that the joy with which we are affected at the beginnings, gradually increased and advanced around the ends, may be multiplied and proceed to the final term. Indeed since these beginnings are splendid and such the first-fruits of this kind, consider from hence what manner of end, befitting such beginnings, shall follow — how great glory and praise he shall obtain, how great good renown, how many crowns — he who has already disposed so many causes of things, and is about to set in place so many of another kind.

You have in this as co-worker and follower where it shall be fitting your most pious son the Emperor, most serene and a lover of Christ (the orator speaks of Emperor John VIII Palaeologus) — who, although many are the things with which he has adorned himself, has this as his foremost quality: zeal for God, ardor for good and piety; who, having had as his contemporary the sacred desire for this holy union of the churches, never ceased diligently to search out the times that

might conduce to this — which at last having been recognized in wisdom and discovered and seized upon most opportunely, he advanced the matter to this point, as it appears. Since he strove toward this one good, since he was wholly moved by this desire, he despised dangers, disdained delights and repose, made light of so great a sea and waves swelling like mountains, and esteemed little moreover both body and life and homeland, so that he might become a co-worker of Christ and might bestow peace upon the Church — whose nursling he not only desires and pledges to be, but also its protector.

Nor shall that sacred and venerable Patriarch fail with equal readiness to yours (the orator speaks of Patriarch Joseph II) — who, although he appears to be of deep old age and is wearied by reason of his body, is nonetheless enriched by a soul growing young in all good things and a fervent spirit, who greatly desires and most earnestly pleads to be judged worthy of the ministry of this work; wherefore he rejoices in the present affairs and embraces the life of the body, so that he may put a good end to this divine work — without which great work he would certainly be burdened by a body already long wearied.

All shall work with you in this intention. In this present contest there is no one who would desire anything else over this most longed-for end; toward this all of us look. The vehement love of this thing inflames the souls of all; for this we have all come from afar; for this we sojourn in a foreign land — men who have sailed from some part from the very midst of Greece, some from the Northern and most Eastern parts of the inhabited world to Italy itself. Let not therefore our enemy overcome such great diligence.

O God our Savior, let not such great and harmful a gathering — so careful, so long-lasting, carried out with so many labors and persevering effort as it is, with us being so many — come to nothing. May the enemy not prevail over this assembly of wise and devout men who know reason, gloating over some against others and conquering. But let him not even touch us: let us arm ourselves with spiritual arms so as to vanquish the enemy; let us take up the breastplate of justice and the helmet of the spirit, and with the word of God as our champion let us attack the enemies (cf. 1 Thess. 5:8; Eph. 6:14); let us at last rest wherever He leads us; let us destroy every high thing that exalts itself against the glory of God (cf. 2 Cor. 10:5); let us root out every proud and vainglorious thought, using humility and the fear of God

as our support in this contest, setting Him before our eyes and striving to apply ourselves to Him. Let us even at times be willing to be well overcome rather than to conquer badly in all things — since not only is the reason of the good saved in overcoming, even if it also has truth with it, but we can also be well overcome while remaining in the same good state and likewise showing the victory — whatever anyone might say that the ultimate good is greater than the first, since it is more beneficial for each person to suffer good than to do it to others, and more to hear than to speak, and to be freed from error than to free others.

Most excellent Emperor, and you most holy Patriarch — the matter has come to this very point, and what you have long been desiring — behold, it is at hand. Now give glory to God; render praise to Him. This is His work. For He placed this in our hearts, He instilled such great love; at last through Him as author we have come to this. If indeed we shall give Him worthy thanks for things past, and for things to come we shall supplicate with our whole heart — we shall truly pay what is our debt; and we shall have God more propitious toward the proposed work, if we show ourselves worthy of our supplications — since in those things in which we shall not be ungrateful for the past, yet in which we shall refer ourselves and all the business to Him, placing all our hope and thought in Him, since He is the one who will nourish us with divine and heavenly food, without which man shall not live. Just as you have carried through all things hitherto — both in supplicating God and imploring His aid, and also in doing what was to be done — so also hereafter, and the more so, the nearer we draw to the end, let us make ourselves more ready, calling upon God and acting yourselves day and night without ceasing, until you shall arrive at the good end and find the repose of your labors; for those things which are driven somewhere by force and have the impulse of movement from without, are moved more slowly the closer they come to the end; but those which are moved from within by nature, are moved more swiftly as they approach the end. But since you are moved from within and as if by nature toward good things — of which the present business is the sum — beware lest you experience the former; but since you desire to attain your proper end forthwith, for a good end is the proper characteristic of the best men in the best affairs, therefore make yourselves and all of us more ready — both by exhorting and by commanding all. But the most blessed Father — if at any time wearied by old age he yields to age or infirmity — have compassion on him and rouse him with words of exhortation and

by the works themselves; and show yourselves effective in all things, the Emperor venerably exhorting, and with the matter more carefully attended to together with us and with all the most reverend prelates of the holy Roman Church, he shall with God as guide put a good end to it. Would that this might come to pass — that with this seen by the eyes of all, and all sustained by more perfect joy and filled more sincerely with spiritual gladness, we may be moved to the praise of the most blessed Father and of your holy empire; and exulting at last with applause, let us build for this most holy Patriarch and this most sacred universal assembly, after the common hymn due to God, a crown of praise. Would that you might give me this final contest; would that I might unfold to you the praise that is common to you; would that you might honor me in this manner; would that I might labor in this final contest; and while we shall have been under one and the same word and Lord of God, praising you both jointly in one and the same speech, I shall render to you, from whom I am bound, what I am able in Christ God, to whom be glory for ages of ages. Amen.

ANDREAS. Immediately upon his conclusion, the reverend Lord Archbishop of Colocensis began with these unpremeditated words:

RESPONSE OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF COLOCENSIS TO THE SPEECH OF THE NICENE

I would have wished, Most High Pontiff, to have come before your Holiness now in such a frame of mind that I might respond with fitting words to what the most reverend Father, the Metropolitan of Nicaea, touched upon in his most ornate and weighty oration — not because he himself omitted anything that I might come to supply, but so that what he most acutely argued concerning the dignity and utility of union, I might also prove in other words; since so great is the excellence of union and peace, and especially in that part which pertains to religion, that there is no sharpness of mind, no abundance of speech, that can adequately describe the dignity of this virtue. But since I have come about to dispute on other matters, which do not admit this kind of argumentation, I therefore do not resolve at present to dispute about those, especially since in this straitness of time both cannot fittingly be accomplished.

Yet this, most holy Father, I am by no means able to pass over in silence. For since in the other offices which pertain to the highest and best pontiff you have attained a most glorious name, in this most pious work you have surpassed even yourself. There is no pontiff of former times who can be compared with you in so sacred a business. For they either gave the first rudiments of religion to individual provinces, or taught many peoples and nations by letters. You have brought to your presence, by your exceptional wisdom and piety — together with your expenditures and triremes — the choicest men of the Eastern nations: Greeks, Ruthenians, Iberians, Wallachians, and others who dwell around the Pontus and Asia. By your most excellent wisdom you have acted so as to convoke an ecumenical synod in Italy, to which this most serene Emperor and that most reverend Patriarch of Constantinople have come most willingly. For since they had long since been inflamed to reverence for your Holiness by the most brilliant fame of your sanctity and your divine works, they wished also to see in person one whom they had formerly venerated with the highest esteem — and with what great desire they did so can be manifestly understood from this: that this most glorious prince, his empire left behind amid the swords, so to speak, of the infidels, and royal pleasures and other delights despised — in which supreme princes are accustomed to take delight — undertook this long pilgrimage at the peril of his life and fortune. Even that most venerable prelate — neither his great age nor his body wearied by long illness could hold him back from hastening through so many dangers to your presence. These also, the most distinguished Fathers of both orders, setting far behind them all their own most dear things, came to you alone as the one to be venerated; for they could not doubt that so great a fervor of yours, such care, such great liberality of expenditures, would not lead to the longed-for desire of both peoples.

Our age possesses something unheard-of and wonderful: that those who for so many long years abhorred the Latin name and religion now hasten toward reconciliation and union. And they understand that after God there is no other author of this wonderful work than your Holiness. They esteem you the most magnificent benefactor, you the most pious shepherd, you the true successor of Peter; in you all the ornaments of the virtues that pertain to the Supreme Pontiff they confess with one voice.

Proceed therefore, most holy Father, as you have begun, and bring so sacred a matter to its completion. For in this way you shall restore the flock of Christ, which for so many passing years had been scattered, and shall bring back the long-wandering sheep to the shepherd. And when that last day shall have come, enriched by the merits of so many peoples and nations, you shall present to Him — in whose office on earth you have striven to accomplish so wonderful a work — so many human souls saved. And these things, most blessed Father, spoken from an unprepared mind in whatever manner, deign to receive. I however, having received your blessing, now turn my face toward that most reverend Father, to hear from him what he himself calls his additions, what he wishes to say.

When these things had been set forth, the choice was given to the Greeks as to which part they wished to undertake — of those who propose or those who respond. With the part of the proposers chosen, the Ephesian, from among the six appointed, spoke thus: "*Since the intention...*"

LUDOVICUS. I ask you to pause briefly: by what means do you set all this down in Latin? Were these things proposed in Latin words?

ANDREAS. Hear a thing wonderful to hear: that the burden was laid upon a certain Nicolaus ... by nation a Greek, who rendered in Latin words — and indeed weighty and eloquent ones — the great matters set forth in the Greek tongue by the Greek Fathers, diverging in nothing in sense and meaning; which was judged by all to be most difficult in translation. And equally, what was set forth in the Latin tongue by our side, he conveyed most fittingly into Greek. There were present from the Latins very many who were learned in Greek letters and gave their judgment on the faithfulness of the translation. Yet by the hearing of all it would have been attributed to impossibility that the manner of translation of matters so most profound could be so facile — since even Jerome boasts greatly of his own abundant mastery of words concerning his own translations; and certain men in our own times won the greatest fame among the Latins for having rendered certain short Greek works into the Latin tongue. But with such facility of excellence of mind and vigor of spirit in the compression of what was set forth, he appeared far preferable to all of whom memory holds, in the transduction of Greek letters into Latin and Latin into Greek. Yet I was present on a certain day when, praised multiply by two of the most reverend lord cardinals — lords of San Marco and of

Sant'Angelo — this man replied: "*This facility of translation in this matter I ascribe to the grace of the Holy Spirit, whose cause is being conducted.*" The response was seen by the judgment of all to be consonant with truth. This man therefore sat on a certain footstool placed between the contestants, rendering everything immediately from Latin into Greek and from Greek into Latin; let those who desire Greek seek out our proceedings from the Greek expositions, and our own from the Latin utterances — for all things were set forth in Greek and Latin through the instrument of the interpreter, and indeed most fittingly and appropriately, and by the report of those who set forth.

LUDOVICUS. But in what manner do you intend to explain all things in order?

ANDREAS. Since I perceived that these were great matters, I took up my pen and, shouldering the task of writing down what was set forth, pursued it; I shall report the sayings of the Greeks from the instrument of the interpreter without any alteration of substance, but those of the Latins from the original utterance of the words by the expositors themselves.

LUDOVICUS. Begin with God's assistance, dearest brother.

ANDREAS. I shall do so, satisfying your wish. Hear first from the Greeks the Archbishop of Ephesus.

[*Manuscript and editorial notes:*]

1: cf. Gill, pp. 37–46. — 3: *in margine: hic inseras sermonem in carta hic ap(p)osita* V. — 4: cf. Gill, pp. 47–48. — 5: *addictiones* V. — 7: thus begins the speech of Mark Eugenicus in Collatio I, 9 October 1438. — 8: cf. Mt. 18:20. — 11: Nicolaus Sagundinus (Secundinus), from Euboea, then Venetian. — 12: *impete* V. — 14: *ac qui* V. — 17: *immiti* V; *doluit* V. — 17: *tranductionis* V. — 18: cf. Jerome, *Praefatio in Pentateuchum* = Migne PL 28, 117–118. — 19: *invalescereque* V. — 22: *latinos et latinus* V; *grecis* V. — 23: Cardinals Angelotto Fusco and Giuliano Cesarini. — 24: *ac* V. — 25: *gratia* V. — 26: *ac qui* V. — 27: *doluit* V. — 28: *delitiis* V. — 29: *commiscen cum lineola supra en* V; *exortatoriis* V. — 30: *exhibite* V. — 31: *tacti* V. — 31–33: what Andreas de Sancta Cruce says

here about his own method is of great importance. For from these words we are made more certain that he reported the speeches (in Greek) of the Greeks in the council according to the Latin version of Nicolaus Sagundinus, while the speeches (in Latin) of the Latins he rendered directly, without the help of Nicolaus Sagundinus. — 33: *oculis* — in the manuscript *occultis*. — 35: *cetu* V. — 36: the eulogy in honor of Mark Eugenicus found in the Greek acts in Gill, pp. 46, which is already called into doubt in a marginal note there, is entirely absent in Andreas de Sancta Cruce and also in the Greek codex 778 (= Zanetti 538), f. 208r–211v of the Library of St. Mark in Venice, perhaps an autograph of Bessarion himself. — 37: cf. Jn. 17:11. — 38: *ostantibus* V. — 40: cf. 1 Thess. 5:8; Eph. 6:14. — 41: cf. 2 Cor. 10:5. — The orator addresses the Supreme Pontiff. — The orator speaks of the Patriarch Joseph II. — 1: *adstante* V. — 4: cf. Rom. 12:16. — 10: *adibe* V. — 14: the orator speaks of Emperor John VIII Palaeologus. — 18: *perscriptaretur* V. — 19: *provinciis* V. — 22: *cooperator* V. — 24: *que rationem* V. — 28: *et finem* V. — 36: *curriculum* V. — 42: *dispersus* V.

THE SECOND BOOK BEGINS, IN WHICH THE GREEKS BEGIN THE COLLOQUIA WITH THE LATINS, AND THE CHOICE HAVING BEEN GIVEN.

COLLOQUY OF THE EPHESIAN

Since the motive of our intention is charity, and that union may subsist in the churches of God, we must proceed with that same charity. Wherefore if any harsh word should happen to be uttered, let it be attributed not to the will but to the subject matter. We shall begin in the name of God. Most reverend Fathers, we ask why the Roman Church added something to the Creed against the prohibitions of the Fathers. Nor do I speak of the difference of the thing added, but of the joining of syllables made to the Creed of the Fathers — a Creed concluded in sense and letters by the authority of the Fathers. This is the intention of our disputation; this is the manner we require to be observed in future: that at the opening of any disputation, the question to be disputed be first brought into the open. If time permits, let us begin the matter proposed; if not, let us defer it to another day.

ANDREAS. Much time had passed in the preliminary addresses and exhortations.

COLOCENSIS. We ourselves also request that, as has already been proposed, if any harshness of words should appear, it be attributed to the difficulties of the matters, not to the will — yet this we ask of you: that the responses to one another be clear, pure, and unambiguous; and so that the response to the proposed question might be clearer, we ask that you give it in writing.

EPHESINUS. Since you judge that time permits, hear certain things concerning the proposed matter. Our Lord and Savior Jesus, at the entrance of His most holy Passion, gave this special precept to His disciples: *"My peace I give to you; my peace I leave to you"* (Jn. 14:27). This was the proper gift to His disciples, requiring one thing of them — that they preserve charity toward one another. The many words of our Savior making mention of charity intimate that this gift of peace belongs to those who have charity, and not to others — as a conditional gift, left as if under a condition, of which one side depends on the other, and the violation of one violates the other as well. And since this is so, we do not know in what manner the Roman Church, violating charity, added anything in the common Creed without the knowledge of the Orientals — something that neither the Fathers, nor the holy doctors, nor the ecumenical councils ever dared to attempt. In the end, the violation of peace was necessarily given, and the most pernicious schism, which has brought such great calamities among the churches of God. But now the Roman Church herself, seeking charity, wished to begin from the very causes — with which removed, the cure of all infirmities will be given. She has convoked us, the Fathers of the Eastern Church, to dispute the causes of the schism; we have come, and gladly, so that with charity found, peace also may be given to one another.

I therefore ask first that we bring ourselves back, with equal charity and intention, to the indubitable and commonly approved common forms and definitions of the ancient councils — and that the forms be read, so that we may be seen as imitators of the holy Fathers. For this was also done in the seventh council: that no ecumenical council was approved before the forms and definitions of the preceding councils had first been read — from which, appearing similar in intention to the holy Fathers, we shall be able through their intercession to attain the desired end. With this form premised, we shall proceed to other matters.

COLOCENSIS. From what you have most wisely set forth, most reverend Fathers, we have gathered five points — which, because they concern the foundation of the faith, we do not judge ought to be answered immediately. But lest so great an assembly depart hence empty, I shall offer some response on my own part. We embrace the charity offered; and since the object of charity is the good, and God who is good first loved us before He granted charity — I marvel why in your words no mention was made of the charity of God, which precedes peace.

As to what you say secondly — that the Roman Church has violated charity — this is not without astonishment to us: since, with so many heresies breaking out and spreading in the Eastern regions, the holy Roman Church immediately brought remedy through distinguished legates and holy doctrines — as Pope Sylvester testifies in the time of Arius, and Celestine in the time of Nestorius — to whose authority, and that of the other Roman Pontiffs, it belongs by the power of the Roman Church to convoke councils. Nor should anyone dare to say that the Roman Church did this before the difference of the Creed — because even after it, she sent various orators so that the Greeks might not wish to deviate from their head.

And retaining the protestation that we suffer words from one another, even if they seem harsh: where is your charity, that having been called so many times you have despised your mother? I approve also what you said — that the Roman Church now likewise seeks charity, which she has always done. Let that Supreme Pontiff be my witness, who presides over the pontificate of the Roman Church, who with the greatest labors, expenses, and dangers has repeatedly sent grave men to the Emperor and the Patriarch. Let Gregory also be adduced, at the Council of Lyons, who even on behalf of the Emperor and the Patriarch dispatched men at his own expense. Charity therefore has remained and remains with the Roman Church.

As to the reading of the constitutions — this does not seem expedient for the hypothesis or proposed problem, since that must be examined from the Gospel; it shall nevertheless be done at the command of the pope according to your desire.

EPHESINUS. Even if the Roman Church preserved charity, these things do not satisfy the question. And that the definitions be read seems a necessity of form.

COLOCENSIS. We shall declare that the matter explained in the Creed has the matter itself and the truth, and so it shall appear that we ought not to differ from one another.

EPHESINUS. The declaration of the truth cannot remove the difference of the added doctrine, since we cannot admit this addition — even if true — against the decrees of the Fathers.

COLOCENSIS. If it is true, why do you not believe us?

EPHESINUS. Because it has been prohibited by the Fathers.

COLOCENSIS. I say that it was lawful for us to explain it, since nothing has been added. Secondly, even if something could be said to have been added, it was lawfully done.

ANDREAS. With these words the assembly of that day was dissolved.

COLLOQUY OF THE SECOND DAY, THE THIRTEENTH OF THE SAME MONTH. THE CARDINAL. COLOCENSIS. THE PROVINCIAL. THE EPHESIAN. THE NICENE.

With the order, manner, and place set forth above, the Colocensis began with these words:

COLOCENSIS. With the blessing of your Holiness preceding, and with the good pleasure of the Emperor and the Patriarch, I shall briefly explain what was proposed yesterday.

EPHESINUS. Yesterday we proposed things only in the manner of an opening; it is not fitting that we hear a response unless we first set forth what we wish.

COLOCENSIS. You asked why and what was added. Hear the reason.

EPHESINUS. Yesterday I said nothing of what is to be said, due to the straitness of time.

COLOCENSIS. On the contrary, you made the question perfectly and asked for a response; complying with your request, hear it.

CARDINAL. It is agreeable that words be brief, but that the agreements be kept — without which being kept, nothing could be accomplished. Yesterday we departed on the understanding that the Colocensis would give a response. Hear him, and you will have the whole day to say what you wish. It is not expedient to read the definitions. We confess both the Creed of the Apostles, and the Nicene Council, and the definitions of the other councils.

COLOCENSIS. Since yesterday three things were touched upon, I shall show that the Roman Church did not give rise to the schism.

EPHESINUS. The choice was given to us of arguing or responding. We choose the parts of the proposers — by which you cannot give responses to the propositions unless you have heard our reasons, by which we say: it was not lawful to add.

COLOCENSIS. Did you not ask me whether I wished to respond? That is a sign that you no longer wished to argue.

EPHESINUS. With all respect, that is not so.

COLOCENSIS. If you wish to hear responses, hear them.

NICENE. We do not wish to hear, unless our reasons are first heard. And I ask whether it is lawful for us to adduce our reasons or not, and whether you wish to condemn us to silence.

COLOCENSIS. Hear the response to the question put by you, and afterward speak as you wish.

NICENE. Although we asked at that time that you respond, we do not deprive ourselves of the inductions of our question.

ANDREAS. Then, with this difficulty standing, one of the six appointed Latins — John of Montenegro, Provincial of Lombardy — spoke thus:

PROVINCIAL. Many things, reverend Fathers, you have proposed concerning charity; and according to Augustine in *De civitate dei*, Book X (Augustine, *De*

civitate dei, lib. X, c. 4 = Migne PL 41, 281), he says: "*charity is such that each should keep his order — which if it be not kept, neither is charity itself.*" There is a twofold manner of proceeding. The first manner is through argumentation — and in this case the one proposing has to adduce propositions and reasons. The other is through inquiry — and in this manner the one asking does not prove. You have chosen this way; and if so, unless this order be kept, charity itself is not kept — with which you said we must proceed.

NICENE. I praise the keeping of charity, but we have chosen the manner of arguing and thus we ought to be heard.

ANDREAS. While these discussions were going on, the Cardinal, rising from the place of the deputies, approached the tribunal of the pope, and then returning, spoke thus:

CARDINAL. Our lord commands me to speak to the most serene prince and the most reverend Patriarch. Our lord was of the opinion that the Colocensis ought to be heard, since he was asked by them to respond; and if this variation is permitted, an occasion will be given and it will happen again in the future. Wherefore since we believe the Colocensis ought to be heard, and you hold the contrary, and the hour is late, it seems right that the six deputies from each side should meet tomorrow, and should agree on the manner of proceeding, so that this difference may not arise again.

EMPEROR. It is agreeable that we rise due to the lateness of the hour; concerning the meeting we shall deliberate with the six.

ANDREAS. And all rose together.

[Manuscript and editorial notes:]

4: cf. Gill, pp. 49–50. — 6: *non inchohabimus* V. — 10: cf. Gill, pp. 50–51. — 12: *prepositum* V. — 13: cf. Gill, pp. 50–51. — 15: *prepositum* V. — 17: cf. Gill, pp. 51–53. — 17: *prepositam* V. — 19: Jn. 14:27. — 21: cf. Gill, p. 53. — 23: cf. Gill, pp. 53–56. — 25: cf. Gill, pp. 57–95. — 27: cf. Gill, p. 57. — 28: cf. Gill, pp.

57–16. — 29: cf. Gill, pp. 58–28–31. — 31: *die* V. — 32: the Cardinal, namely Iulianus Cesarini. — 32: the Provincial, namely of Lombardy, Ioannes de Montenegro O.P. — 35: cf. Gill, pp. 59–9. — 36: *hec* V. — 37: *preposita* V; *preposuimus* V. — 1: cf. Gill, pp. 59–13–14. — 2: cf. Gill, pp. 59–17–10. — 3: cf. Gill, pp. 59–21–25. — 5: cf. Gill, pp. 60–31–61–12. — 10: cf. Gill, pp. 62–9–13; also note: after *scilicet* read *differentiam symboli sive postea*. — 10: cf. Gill, pp. 62–29–33. — 12: *preponentium* V. — 13: *prepositionibus* V. — 13: cf. Gill, pp. 62–24. — 14: *adheri* V. — 21: cf. Gill, p. 63–1. — 22: cf. Gill, pp. 63–6–15. — 22: Augustine, *De civitate dei*, lib. X, c. 4 = Migne PL 41, 281 (allusion). — 26: *preposuiatis* V; expected *dicitur*. — 27: cf. Gill, pp. 64–9–19. — 28: cf. Gill, pp. 64–9–19. — 29: *preponentis* V; *prepositionis* V. — 32: *eligemus* V. — 32: cf. Gill, pp. 64–20–65–1. — 33: *discussionibus* V. — 35: cf. Gill, pp. 65–1–16. — 37: cf. Gill, pp. 59–10. — 15: Eugenius IV. — 17: Gregory X. — 13: *kritas* V.

THIRD COLLOQUY HELD ON THE SIXTEENTH OF OCTOBER

With all assembled in the manner described above, after the celebration of Mass — which was the customary hour of the assembly — the Ephesian began with these words.

LUDOVICUS. Before you bring the Ephesian's speech into the open, tell me please: how did it come about that in the previous disputation the Latins yielded to the Greeks as if defeated?

ANDREAS. The matter itself gives judgment as to who was relying on the greater reason; but it seemed right that a guest should yield to the hosts. So it was necessary to yield to courtesy, lest the beginnings take a breach. Yet I do not wish to excuse myself before you: I had always been of the opinion that on these premises the same audacity ought not to be given, nor should any place for speaking be given at all. I judged that the matter brought into the open by them did not concern a cause of faith, and thus they were rightly not to be heard, as not concluding what they wished. What was brought into the open seemed to concern more the differences of bodily wills and their remedies of restitution than truth itself — which is faith — and since there is no possession of spiritual things, given that this falls under legal title, I held it to be ridiculous for this to fall within faith.

And even if the expression of the dogma were true, what was to be examined was whether it was lawful to express it — especially concerning God — since it would be against faith to be silent about anything true concerning the knowledge of God. With the utmost persuasion at my disposal, I pressed that they ought not to be heard — as bringing forward a petition inept to the matter at hand, and concerning not faith but the positive law of controversies, straying from every boundary of faith. It seemed right to those of pious disposition who sought union, to the Supreme Pontiff, and to the most reverend Cardinal of Sant'Angelo, that they be heard, even if they were to bring forward every impertinence. The Ephesian therefore began, with the license to speak given, in this manner.

EPHESINUS. Since it has been conceded to us that the definitions of the ancient councils be read, we wish to read them, so that we may conform ourselves to the first Fathers.

CARDINAL. If we wish to arrive at the end we desire, it is necessary to keep promises; and although Lord Colocensis was to come today to be heard, we agreed yesterday that you would bring forward the exposition of your opinions as you wished, and would read in this order — and read whatever you wish. When something is to be read in common, we shall agree on those matters; we shall likewise have read what we wish for our part. That we agreed thus I wrote down yesterday in my own hand, which I present in writing.

EMPEROR. It is agreeable that each side read by itself what it wishes.

CARDINAL. Read then.

EPHESINUS. We shall not read all things now, but as it shall be expedient. We ask your paternity to be willing to hear us with all patience, as we set forth the definitions of those Fathers and approve our proposition — since we intend to prove that it was not lawful to depart from the definitions of the Fathers, nor to add to the faith and to those things that were composed by the Fathers.

ANDREAS. A certain monk, having taken up a book, read the Nicene Creed in the Greek tongue, proclaimed into Latin by the interpreter.

EPHESINUS. This definition having been read, in the third synod this Creed was read, and afterward follows a prohibition in this manner: *"With these having been read, the holy synod prohibits the writing or composing of any other faith besides that determined by the Nicene Fathers. But those who have dared to compose another faith, or to bring it forward for the inquiry of truth, or to teach it, or to hand over to those wishing to convert from paganism or from Judaism or from any other faith another creed — even if they were bishops — let them be deprived: bishops of the episcopate, clergy of the clerical state; if monks or laymen, let them be excommunicated"* (Denzinger 125).

Now when we come to these things, two things seem to be inquired. First, in what way and by what reason these holy Fathers exercised such great custody over what they expounded, which those in the first council had not done. Second, why they did not wish to make mention of the Creed of the second council, but only of the first synod — given that there is a difference in words and syllables.

We say that this was done as the nature of the matter itself demonstrates. For if those who made the first Creed had prohibited anything from being added, they would seem to have wished to arrogate something to themselves. But the Fathers of the third council, seeing that what had been done was right, wished to confirm it by prohibiting anything further from being added. This was also done in the New Testament, when the Evangelists did not wish to arrogate this to themselves nor to put in their Gospels that no one was permitted to add anything, etc. But afterward the holy Fathers made the prohibition.

We bring another reason from circumstances: since after the first exposition of the Creed of the faith, much time having passed between the first and the second council, many expositions were made — more than thirty in number — which, because they had been made privately and in particular ways, brought doubt at first concerning consubstantiality, which was not so acceptable to hear. But the second council, having the authority of the first ecumenical council, wished to expand upon and declare certain articles concerning the Holy Spirit, and likewise certain words concerning the Incarnation that were not in the first Creed — namely: *"And He was incarnate of the Holy Spirit from the Virgin Mary."* And it did this because it was lawful to it, and did not wish to prohibit this, lest it seem to abrogate those

things it had added; but such a declaration became a cause of impediment in the Church of God.

For from this, with the occasion taken, those who held the opinion of Nestorius made privately one other exposition, and in order to give others license to hold that opinion, they baptized in that creed — and from that of Nestorius many other things were made. Therefore, with the third ecumenical council assembling, they wished to approve the Creed of the first council and defined that not even they themselves were permitted to add or subtract anything from that Creed; and they approved this in deed. And that expression concerning the Mother of God, which was promulgated by the third synod — since it was necessary — they did not wish to add into the Creed, but placed it in another definition.

Now I come to give the reason for the third point: why the Fathers of the third council did not wish to make mention of the Creed of the second council. That the Creed of the second council was admitted in the third council as being the same as the Creed of the first — this is proved from the matters themselves, and it is manifest that they were not ignorant of the Creed of the second synod, nor had they despised it. How could they have done so, since it had been approved and seen and held by Christians? Therefore they spoke only of the first on account of authority — since there had been more Fathers there — and because that was the foundation of the second council, and because Christians made greatest use of the first and were baptized in it. Likewise, because the second was virtually contained in the first. Likewise, because those treating of what could not lawfully be added — since something had been added in the second council — in order not to seem to be making a distinction, they made no mention of the second, knowing it to be contained in virtue within the first. And therefore they declared that nothing could be added, not only in sense but not in word either; and if anything necessary were to be added or declared therein, they commanded it to be placed in other definitions. And there are many authorities of Cyril, who presided over that third council, and the letter of Pope Celestine, Archbishop of Rome, which begins: *"In no way do we suffer anything to be added to what has been expounded at Nicaea"* (cf. Mansi V, 308 E – 309 A).

ANDREAS. That monk also arose, reading in Greek the letter of Cyril and of Pope Celestine; and when these had been read, the Ephesian continued with these words.

EPHESINUS. You have heard, most reverend Fathers, the prohibition of the pope — which prohibition was read and approved in the fourth council.

ANDREAS. He also nodded to the scribe who was holding the book, who read in the Greek tongue the approval of the fourth council; and when these had been read, he commanded the prohibitions of the fifth council to be brought into the open. And when these had been read, and the letters of the pope having been read and expounded, they read the acts of the sixth great council, and the letter of Pope Agatho of Rome — who presided over the sixth council — to the council, and another letter to the Emperor; and at last, when these had been read, they read the definitions of the seventh great council, which was held at Nicaea for the second time.

LUDOVICUS. Was the Creed of each council read?

ANDREAS. They seemed to be in agreement; but when the Creed of the seventh synod was being read, the Cardinal produced a most ancient Latin book, in which in that council the word *filioque* was present. He added that from the authentic Martinian Chronicle it is recorded that in that seventh council that doctrine had been expounded; and when the subscriptions had been read, it was found: "*...the representative of the Roman See of Pope Hadrian of Rome, and Peter, abbot of Sant'Andrea, and Sabbas, and Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople.*" With these having been read, the Ephesian began thus.

EPHESINUS. You have heard, most reverend Fathers, the sentences of the Fathers. We, seeing the sentences of the Fathers and considering their authority and fearing their curses, can by no means admit that addition which you have made. Now it remains — unless the hour prevents — that we hear the responses and reasons of your paternities; and with your most reverend paternities having been heard, we shall adduce the authorities of many Fathers who tend to these conclusions. You know that we are not arithmeticians, nor are we skilled in the rhetorical arts, so as to bring forward what is said in a polished manner. But what is said with truth, we admit; what conflicts with it, we reject.

CARDINAL. Most blessed Father, let it be deferred to the Emperor, who desires an end to be set. But since the Creed of the seventh council as read by them does not

have the doctrine *filioque*, and we have it with that word, it seems right that it also be read in our manner, as we have it.

ANDREAS. The pope nodded that it should be read, and it was read by our scribe with the said doctrine. When this had been read, the Cardinal spoke thus.

CARDINAL. Since it is agreeable that a response be given briefly and distinctly — in order to comply with your wishes — it seems right that what has been set forth by you, written down by the notaries, be listened to.

EMPEROR. It is agreeable that tomorrow they assemble at the fifteenth hour.

ANDREAS. With these things having been set forth, we all rose, the hour being now the twenty-first.

[*Manuscript and editorial notes:*]

4: *sedecima octobris* V. — 1: cf. Gill, pp. 65–17–18. — 3: *prepositione* V; *prepositionis* V. — 3: *prepositam* V. — 6: *in margine: non, quia nos in simbolo apostolorum baptizamus* V. — 7: *Assurrexit et monacus* V. — 8: Denzinger 54. — 9: cf. Gill, pp. 68–29–73–16. — 14: *Agatonis* V. — 18–34: Gill, pp. 68–1–2. — 18: cf. Gill, pp. 85–14–16. — 20: *autentica* V; cf. Martin of Oppaviensis (Martinus Oppaviensis), *Chronicon* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores 22, 461). — 21: after *est* there is a blank space of one long word in the manuscript; *Andreani* in V. — 22: *Athanasius* V — read *Tarasius*. — 24: cf. Gill, pp. 86–30–87–1; 87–22–30. — 27: *arismeticos* V. — 28: *occaxione* V. — 30: *diffinierant* V. — 35: cf. Gill, pp. 87–39–88–1. — 38: *fecisset* V; *tentu* V. — 5: No letter of Celestine begins in this manner; the citation is from a letter of Cyril of Alexandria; cf. Mansi V, 308 E – 309 A. — 9: cf. Gill, pp. 73–31–74–9. — 19: *primum et secundum*, namely *concilium*. — 30: *conveniremus* V. — 36: *preposi-tionem* V.

FOURTH ASSEMBLY HELD ON THE TWENTIETH OF OCTOBER

When we had assembled together for this fourth contest and all were waiting, the Colocensis directed these words to the Supreme Pontiff.

COLOCENSIS. Let your blessing be present, most blessed Father.

ANDREAS. He then addressed words to the interpreter.

COLOCENSIS. I shall set forth the words in Latin, so as to keep to the form. You, however, shall translate them for these Fathers into Greek. If nevertheless I should wish to explain something in Greek, I do not deprive myself of that faculty.

INTERPRETER. In the translation I was reproached yesterday by your paternity — though, as I judge, less than was deserved. I do not wish to translate except what is spoken in Greek into Latin, since the Greeks take confidence from that.

ANDREAS. The Emperor nonetheless commanded him to carry out both tasks. At his command, taking his seat on the footstool, he showed himself prepared from that point for both. The contest therefore began in this manner.

The two colloquia of Lord Colocensis I had not taken care to have written down, because they were not formally collected; but since in the seventh colloquy he himself repeated all of it, they were therefore not written down here — but see his words set forth there, where he declared what he had here expressed in a confused manner.

[Manuscript and editorial notes:]

The heading reads: *vigesima octobris* V. — The note regarding the two colloquia of Colocensis indicates that the seventh colloquy contains his full and formal restatement of what he had expressed here in summary form.

SIXTH COLLOQUY, ON THE FIRST OF NOVEMBER

On the day of the Kalends of November, at the customary hour after Mass, with all assembled and the license to speak granted by mutual silence, the Nicene — third among the six Greeks — brought these words into the open.

NICENE. Having heard patiently, most reverend Fathers, what has been set forth, we have come ready to give a response to those things, hoping you will hear us

with equal patience. Let mutual patience among us show charity, since we begin from one and the same principle and tend toward one goal — namely the union of the Church. Let us comply with the custom of the Church, not with private feelings. You gave a fourfold response. From the four things, as you asserted, set forth by us, you judge that you gave a response to each one; and to avoid our deductions, you attempted to say four things. First: that the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Son and the Father is not an addition but a declaration. Second: that it is lawful in the Creed to declare what was first expounded. Third: that this dogma is consonant with the reason of the Fathers of the Church. Lastly: that since it contains truth, every Christian ought to embrace it.

Two of these you touched upon in your first colloquy and in your second colloquy; when it remained to speak of the other two, you said — in order to comply with us — that you wished to omit them, and that if they were necessary, it had nonetheless been lawful to say them; as it was lawful for you concerning the first two, you complied rather with yourselves than with us. For those of them in which you complied with us, we give thanks; and with charity we shall prove that those two things do not pertain to our proposition. But since you attempted to set forth certain things concerning the fourth point — that truth is to be embraced by all — we do not deny this, since whoever has the sense and receives the object of truth, let him aim at that which we ourselves are also about to treat together. The third part, concerning which you also said certain things, we shall reserve for when the truth of the dogma is treated — at which time, by God's grace, we shall bring forward indeed very many reasons.

I shall therefore take up from what you have set forth those things which touch the question posed by us — since it seems the first matter, when what is expedient concerning the truth of the dogma is to be discussed, is this: namely, that even if it be true, it was not lawful to inscribe it in the Creed. We say that that dogma, even if true, cannot stand in the Creed; for many necessary things, even if true, have not been appended to the Creed. We shall strive in all things toward truth, but a brief response to the proposition cannot be complete if it extends far. I shall therefore speak of what was set forth concerning the first points, insofar as they touch the proposition of our question. In the deduction that the dogma is not an addition, you used a certain syllogism — of which syllogism I shall take the major premise,

which bears on the proposition, and omit what was brought forward for the proof of the minor premise.

In the proof of this major premise you used another syllogism; and at last you attempted to confirm it through the acts and definitions of past sacred councils, and at last through the voice and words of Lord Ephesinus. The form of that syllogism is this:

Every addition is from without. A declaration is not from without. Therefore a declaration is not an addition.

We accept the major premise of this syllogism — that an addition is from without — although we could deny it with respect to the matter at hand. But we do not admit the minor premise, which says that a declaration is not from without but from the thing itself. For we also will concede that a declaration is of the things that have been posited, but not about the things posited. A declaration is of those things that have been posited, but not about them. For every declaration — especially this one of which we speak — is referred to a reason or word that is external, to which word or reason it stands as the minor proposition to the major; so a declaration stands to the thing declared.

We say that the Spirit proceeds from the Father; when you wish to infer also from the Son, you take this from external authority — namely that all things that are the Father's are the Son's. This proof is taken from what is external. Therefore the reason that affirms the minor premise is taken from without. Therefore it does not follow that a declaration is not from without; but sometimes it is taken from without and sometimes not — indeed it is most often taken from without. For it has the major premise from without. Then it has terms that are taken from without, at least. Hence the contrary of what you say follows — that every declaration is from without. Hence it seems to be concluded that in saying the Spirit proceeds from the Son, even if it were a declaration, it is one taken from without; and you yourselves said: an addition comes from without according to the philosopher, and cannot be identical with the thing to which it is added. For even nutrition, since it is from without according to the philosopher and comes to resemble the thing to which it is added, is never added unless it takes on a likeness; and what is similar is not identical according to the philosopher. Wherefore since an addition does two things

— first that it takes on the likeness of the thing to which it is added — this expression *filioque*, even if it be similar to the thing added, has at least a likeness of terms, and also has a dissimilarity; from which it cannot be denied that — even if it came in the manner of a declaration — it is nonetheless an addition. This addition seems to be the one that was prohibited, and this word was prohibited from being appended.

When however you adduced the acts of the Fathers by which certain things seem to be declared, this does not touch what is ours. That something be appended to the faith in the Creed — this has never been lawful nor shall it ever be. But to expound what is implicitly contained in sacred Scripture — this was lawful for those Fathers, and even to place it in the Creed, except for adding anything from sacred Scripture itself. But afterward this part of the license was prohibited, so that nothing be added in the Creed. To bring forth declarations of sacred Scripture in one's own writings has been permitted to anyone and has not hitherto been prohibited; and these things were done out of necessity. For since such license was permitted at will up to the time of the second ecumenical council — because some used such license to their own harm — with the presupposition that the Fathers of the third council understood that such license produced nothing good, they sealed it off and approved for the faithful that henceforth no one be permitted to add anything. For to hold what the first holy Fathers believed cannot bring error. For who, with an imperfect faith — would dare to argue? But through addition many scandals might arise for the faithful even through the change of syllables — which the first Fathers of the third council prohibited, as is clear.

Let the letter of the blessed Cyril be adduced — which he sent to Acacius — in which he says: *"The holy and ecumenical synod which met at Ephesus has provided, of necessity, that another exposition of the faith should not be brought into the Church of God beyond the existing one, which our Fathers — who spoke in the Holy Spirit — determined"* (Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistola Acacio episcopo Melitinae scripta*, apud Mansi V, 309 sq.; Migne PG 77, 189 A). From these three principal things are to be noted: first, that the third synod itself was the first to prohibit additions — this force the Greek word *ekthesin* carries; second, that this was done of necessity; third, that what is prohibited is not another exposition of a different faith, but another exposition of that same faith; and that this prohibition

proceeds from the common fullness of the Church. That contrary dogmas and oppositions should not be made — this had already been prohibited from the beginning. To what end did the third synod bring in a prohibition, unless to prohibit the variation of words and syllables — which had hitherto been permitted?

But neither did they prohibit anyone from declaring things in private writings; for the Church does not concern itself with the words by which each person privately knows God, as long as the end is one. Care was taken for the common Creed of faith, in which all were baptized — that it stand immutable. And the Fathers themselves even in words prohibited the word *Theotokos* — that is, Mother of God — not wishing to add it to the Creed, even though it seemed necessary; and even though it would have been nothing but a declaration of what was expressed, since these words — namely that the Son descended from the heavens, is consubstantial with the Father, and was incarnate from the virgin — called for this declaration. And if you were to say that it was not added because it was manifestly contained in the Creed, many other things that were not so openly contained were by no means added: the very expression of the union in person of the Son of God with our nature — concerning which the Fathers of the third synod; and that the Son of God and Word after the union obtained two natures — concerning which the Fathers of the fourth council; and that He preserved in Himself two natural operations and wills — concerning which are the considerations of the Fathers.

These were by no means added to the Creed, whether they were clear or obscure things to be added. The Fathers abstained from adding to the Creed. All the holy councils that followed the third council show this most openly — that they wished nothing to be added.

And if you say something about the variety of books, in another place the seventh sacred council will be shown to have followed those that preceded it.

And when you say that the Apostle Paul before the third council prohibited another faith from being published — I grant this; but this does not prejudice the Fathers. For Paul makes mention of another faith; the Fathers did not expound another faith, nor would it have been in any way lawful for them to do so (cf. Gal. 1:8).

And when the blessed Gregory the Theologian says that he holds the same as the Fathers of Nicaea — though he was declaring things that had not been so clearly promulgated by them — I say this was done before the prohibition. Therefore it avails nothing for those things that were done afterward.

But if anything was done after the prohibition, show it. If anything at all was added, we too shall follow it. And that this was by no means done — the works of the Fathers cry out.

The reasons are consonant with the works, clearer than the sun. The Creed is the common possession of all Christians. And although Gregory the Theologian says more explicitly that a diversity of syllables, with the same sense given, does not introduce novelty — he speaks of expressions signifying the same thing and predicated of one and the same subject, such as: four, twice two; or to say *rectum* rather than *obliquum*. But in our matter it is different; for to various expressions there are various senses. For the person of the Father is one thing, that of the Son is another.

Secondly, when you say that Greeks and Latins put forth the Creed in different syllables — in our difficulty we say not only that there are various voices and expressions, but indeed various senses and different meanings of each and every word. For to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father is one statement; that it proceeds from the Father and the Son comprises two statements, which are joined into one; wherefore they have two opposing reasons: one of them is false — either: He does not proceed from the Father; or the other: He does not proceed from the Son — and we say this latter to be true, you say the contrary.

These are not words signifying the same thing in various voices. It is clear that in Latin *bonus dies* is the same as *kalimera* in Greek (καλή ἡμέρα — "good day") — wherefore a variety of words in this case does not introduce a difference; and in this there was an agreement among us, that each might put forth the faith in his own language. The added thing, not sounding the same, makes a difference — and not only between us and the Latins, but even among ourselves, if someone from among our number were to say it in Greek.

And when for the third point you said that the principles and dignities of any art are capable of containing all that follows — adding that proceeding from those principles themselves, you had most easily shown it to be necessary to say that the Spirit also proceeds from the Son, and that this would follow from principles common to us and to you — when you prove these things, we shall give you thanks; but we shall not oppose these principles themselves. For this is universally impossible in all principles of universal matters, and especially of faith — which is what we are now discussing. For principles and what follows from them are in many things distinct, and perhaps in all. For the principle is universal; what follows is particular. And the principle is what demonstrates; what follows is what is demonstrated. The principle is a proposition; what follows are conclusions. How shall universals become particulars, and demonstrating things become demonstrated things? Wherefore it is necessary that principles contain what follows. But that something be added to the principles is not necessary — and then far more difficult, if there were a prohibition forbidding this, as in our case; especially since many other things that are true and are contained in the principles — for all the dogmas of the Christian faith are contained in the principles of sacred Scripture — were nonetheless not wished to be added.

When you say that since the Church of God is one, it is fitting that it always have one power — we say that even if the power of the Church is one, it must nonetheless preserve as immutable those things that were handed down by those who preceded; and with this immutability given in things uniformly concerning defined matters, it is confirmed that there is always one authority of the Church. For otherwise the Church would overturn itself. A means was given so that private letters might meet with what arises; so it was done by Tarasius and Agatho.

Lastly you touched upon ten small parts which contain what has been expressed, although some have them more clearly. You were astonished at first that we brought forward the Creed of the Nicene Council; we say this was done of a certain necessity, so that with that having been read, the prohibition made in the third synod might be seen.

ANDREAS. The Nicene, while speaking, was asked whether the Creed of the second synod had been read in the third. He responded:

NICENE. Only the first was read; but both of us asserted that with the reading of the first, the second was read virtually.

Secondly, you gave that the prohibitions of the Fathers are referred to the exposition of a different faith, not to a declaration; yet this is sufficiently proved by the works of the Fathers — that even a declaration was prohibited.

Thirdly, you argued from the principles and dignities themselves; beyond what has already been said, we say: it does not necessarily follow that what you wish to introduce from the principles does so. For no principle of any discipline or art can receive a conclusion into the principle itself; it can well be the cause of a conclusion. For many declarations were necessary for theology, yet were not added to the principles; therefore a declaration is not always to be added to the principles. Therefore, since addition is not made to the principles of sacred Scripture nor to the Creed, let your addition be removed — since sacred Scripture and the Creed concur equally. We admit that you say all things following the third council are referred to that council — yet the third council cannot be the exposition of the others, since the things that follow from what preceded are for the most part declaratory.

Let us therefore stand by the expounders Cyril and Agatho, who declared the third council. Since then a necessity pressed upon the third council, those holy Fathers set forth that prohibition, as Cyril expressly declares. It is clear that the same was the purpose of the other councils as well, which they demonstrated by their works.

We shall leave other things for a future assembly, so that contending together, one may meet the other. And so let that one from your Fathers who offered to contend with me specifically prepare himself for the second assembly.

ANDREAS. With these words having been spoken, we all rose together at the twenty-first hour of the day.

[Manuscript and editorial notes:]

4: *sedecima ottobris* V (the heading should read: Kalends of November). — 5: *expeditaretur forte nos* V. — 8: *tradutione* V. — 9: *erspectaretur debite* V. — 12: *differentom* V. — 13: *est* V. — 13: *post hec spatium vacuum circa 4 linearum* V. — 14: Whose syllogism — that of Andreas, Archbishop of Rhodes. — 16: *Recipimus* V. — 18: *calamera* V: *bonus dies* = καλή ἡμέρα. — 21: cf. Gill, pp. 138–153. — 23: *secuntur* V. — 27: *prepositionem* V. — 29: *secuntur* V; *prepositionis* V. — 30: *secuntur* V. — 33: *gexistis* V. — 34: *prepositionum* V. — 36: *ad-ditioni videtur* V. — 37: *esse exspectaretur forte dubium* V. — 38: *esse exspectaretur forte dubium* V. — 40: *Aghatonem* V. — 1: cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Epistola Cledonio* = Migne PG 37, 193 C. — 4: *presupposito* V. — 5: *opere* V. — 10: Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistola Acacio episcopo Melitinae scripta*, apud Mansi V, 309 sqq.; 316 C; Migne PG 77, 189 A; in this text Bessarion insists on the words: μή δεῖν ἑτέραν πίστεως ἔκθεσιν ταῖς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις εἰσκρίνεσθαι ("that another exposition of the faith should not be introduced into the churches of God"). — 10: *Acrisium* V — read *Acacium*. — 14: *addictiones* V; after the Greek word, blank space of about 3 words in V. — 23: *Thetheton* V — read *Theotokon*. — 29: *sortisse* V. — 38: cf. Gal. 1:8.

SEVENTH COLLOQUY, 4 NOVEMBER

When the sacred consistory had assembled after the offering of prayers and the solemnities of the Masses, with silence having been made, the Nicene — who had spoken the day before — continued with these words.

NICENE. Since we have given the best responses to the many things set forth by your paternity, we omitted certain things on account of the brevity of the hour — things which are nonetheless contained in virtue and force in what was said. But from your side, these are the things that require responses.

You said that to move the faith through the Creed is one thing, and to declare it is another; and that Agatho extended and enlarged in the exposition he made concerning the faith; and that the very word *Theotokos* did not necessarily need to be appended; and that the holy Roman Church had done these things moved by the authority of the Fathers and the saints of the Church, compelled by necessity, and by its own authority, which it holds in matters of this kind.

To the first point, we say that the word "to move" does not carry the sense you believe. For what follows after is: *"that it is not lawful to add either a word, or an expression, or a syllable"* (cf. Mansi XI, 289 A).

and this is confirmed by the works themselves. For when necessities were pressing for declarations to be made, they made no declarations.

As for what the blessed Agatho says — that the integrity of the faith ought to be preserved in words and in sense — we do not understand this as you do, but we understand it as a universal prohibition of every mutation. This is clearly gathered from what Agatho presupposes: that he neither diminished nor enlarged nor changed those things which belong to the faith; and subsequently he rightly posits that the same faith ought to be preserved in word and in sense. Since therefore he imposes a prohibition upon augmentation, diminution, or change of words and expressions, he himself seems to be of our opinion; and the fact that he himself adds some exposition of his own does not bear upon our question — since it has never been prohibited, nor shall it be, that a private and particular exposition of the faith be made in particular and diverse words. But the discipline of the faith itself and the Creed ought to remain immutable in all things, as Agatho himself expressly intimates.

When you said that the word *Theotokos* was not altogether necessary to be placed there — we do not know in what way this was done. If it was not necessary, it ought not to have been placed anywhere at all; and in vain so many Fathers would have solemnly deliberated over it, and it would have been superfluously added elsewhere. If however it was necessary, then our position holds.

As to what you say — that the addition was made by the holy Roman Church out of necessity and by the authority of the saints — whether the holy Roman Church was moved by authority will be seen in other disputations and will be the subject of reflection in those that follow. If however it was moved by authority or necessity, we say that necessity is in no way an obstacle to the definitions of the Fathers, since no necessity appears to be excepted; and in due time, with charity, we shall ask what that necessity was. But concerning the authority of the Roman Church we have much to say, were it not that our purpose is otherwise. For we know and recognize how far such authority extends. But first we wish you to know that such

license — that something be added to the Creed — we except from both the ecumenical synod and the universal Church, not only from the Roman. And since we except it from the universal, therefore not even the Roman can do it; and this is not something we do, but the Fathers did it in their own definitions.

We said these things in response to your propositions, not wishing to rely on these alone, but on others to be brought forward in their proper place and time. We say therefore that the definitions of the Fathers extend to any declaration whatsoever; and when we hear the Fathers saying: *"it is lawful for no one to add or diminish"*, we understand this as applying to syllable and expression alike. We submit that the testimonies of the holy Fathers bear upon these matters. We ask whether the definitions and the prohibitions contained in them refer to the Creed or not.

ANDREAS. With these things set forth, silence was made, with our six looking on; they were likewise addressed with a question by those same six. And with the cardinals convoked — who were seated in their place — the cardinals and the six deputies alike proceeded together to the Supreme Pontiff at his tribunal; and all spoke together, all declaring the matter to be indeed one of faith, and that they had acted so maturely in all things.

LUDOVICUS. What followed at last?

ANDREAS. The six deputies returned to their assigned place. At last the Cardinal, who had been first among them, spoke thus.

CARDINAL. By the command of our most holy lord, I shall relate certain things. This sacred assembly has heard what you set forth both today and yesterday. We had agreed that what was to be said should be put in writing; therefore, so that the form may be observed, let those who wrote meet and come to agreement on the writings, so that on Thursday, when you assemble, you may receive a full and pertinent response.

And to your question we give this response. From the words you set forth concerning the acts of the third council: the Fathers read the Nicene Creed, the letter of Cyril to Nestorius, the blasphemies of Nestorius, the creed of Nestorius and of Tarasius, the authorities of the other saints together with certain definitions of the faith — and afterward it follows: *"With these things thus recited, let it be*

lawful for no one to put forward or expound another faith, etc., than that which was expounded by the Fathers assembled at Nicaea."

We say that the prohibition refers to all things that were expounded at Nicaea, and it has regard not so much to the Creed as to the other definitions. But do you, Fathers, patiently hear certain things to be said by Lord Colocensis.

ANDREAS. Before Colocensis spoke, the Cardinal asked the Greeks in this manner to produce the acts of the Council of Chalcedon. To which the Greeks responded: *"We do not have the complete synod."* Then the Cardinal said that original books, not extracts, ought to be brought. With the pope giving his assent, Colocensis addressed them with these words.

COLOCENSIS. Certain things have been repeated by you on these days which, in my judgment and that of my colleagues, do not appear to stand in the order in which they were said. Moreover, since I had confirmed and shown certain things by the firmest argument, you declared them in a different sense, and plainly denied certain things. But since all such matters are most conducive to our present contest, allow me, I beseech you, most excellent Fathers, to repeat them briefly and to state my position and refute yours.

First of all I shall put forward that holy exhortation of yours — that since one and the same is the end for both, one ought to use patience and moderation — let it be kept in mind, and let you yourselves do the same; adding this: that what is said with upright mind and simple heart should not be taken with sinister understanding. For we ourselves did the same — certain things that sounded most harsh we bore with an even mind, and shall do so in future. With this done, charity will remain inviolate and the desired end will be attained.

You wished, Fathers, to repeat the things said by me — yet you did not repeat them in the same order nor with the same meaning. For your problem had been: how the holy Roman Church had made lawful what had been prohibited. To this I said: that it was not an addition; that it was not prohibited; that it was true; that it was done under the impulsion of the greatest necessity; that it was a manifest truth in the Church of God; and that it was fitting that it be done by the Roman Pontiff, to whose office these matters are known to pertain in a special way — from which I

concluded that it was altogether lawful for the Roman Church to make that declaration.

Your repetition preserved neither the order itself nor the meaning. Therefore it is necessary to make special mention of this at present.

In the second step, you said that we of our own free will omitted the third small part, when we had been heard at will. Is it not evident from what was set forth? Did not Lord Nicene say that what was being said did not touch the question, and that you did not intend to give a response to them? What remained except to be silent? Why pour out words to those who were not listening to them? And we came unwillingly to silence on that part — and indeed most sorrowfully. For from the proof of that part it was easy to prove that it had been lawful for the Roman Church to make declarations. I wished to repeat this, so that it might be clear to all what was the reason that part was omitted.

And when you wished to give a response to a certain syllogism of ours, you adduced other things. We used this argumentation: *No exposition or declaration of any expression is an addition; but to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son is an explanation of what is contained in the first; therefore it is not an addition.* You, in reply, said: *Every addition comes from without; therefore an exposition is not an addition.*

ANDREAS. With these things set forth, the Nicene said the following.

NICENE. I say that all things said by us have a fitting response. Concerning this syllogism we are astonished, since all things we said are written down. We passed over the syllogism about which you are speaking; but we came to meet the syllogism by which you used the first syllogism to prove.

COLOCENSIS. I did not use the syllogism you speak of; it is true that as confirmation of the major premise I premised this: that every addition comes from without — nor did I use a syllogism, but a comparison from the teaching of the philosophers, who say that comparisons ought to be brief, because a comparison has both conformity and non-conformity. This I have from the teaching of your Greece.

NICENE. Your paternity says what you please, and you can say it; but what we said is written down, and we listened to everything, and from those words we took our response.

COLOCENSIS. Let us come to other things. I was saying that the dogma *filioque* is comprehended in the word "Father." Your paternity had responded that the middle term by which it is proved was taken from without — namely the assumption that whatever the Father has, the Son has — asserting this to be from without. But it must be understood what in a discipline is called "from without" — according to the philosophers and especially Aristotle (cf. Aristotle, *Analytica posteriora*, lib. I, c. 28 = Didot I, 149): that in a discipline is called "from without" which is not subjected to the subject of the same science, nor has the same part, nor property, nor attribute — as if we were to say that arithmetic is distant from natural philosophy, and astronomy from moral philosophy, in which the subjects are distinguished. In another manner, "from without" is said of what is not in the same expression — as that the Spirit proceeds from the Son is of another expression and sense. And I am ignorant of how you take "from without"; if you take "from without" as meaning that there is not one subject in one and another of the problems, consider whether this is soundly said — a greatest incongruity against the faith would follow. For it would follow that the faith of the Gospels is different from the Creed. Second: that the proposition "*whatever the Father has, etc.*" would not follow from the discipline of the Creed; in all disciplines, what is the subject of one discipline cannot prove another property of any subject of another discipline. If therefore this saying of the Savior were of a different object, nothing would be concluded from what is set forth in the Creed — how alien this is from the Christian faith, your paternities see. And certainly what is primary in faith, or immediately from the first principles, cannot be called foreign or alien. Is it not taken from the teaching of the Gospel? Therefore the Gospel is the principle for those things that are in the Creed; therefore it is its proper principle, not foreign and not from without. This is clear — that the Gospel is the principle of the Creed — because the Apostles, wishing to carry out God's precept that they preach the Gospel to every creature (cf. Mk. 16:15), so that they might agree equally in the act of preaching the Gospel, made from the Gospel the Creed which is called the Apostles' Creed. It follows therefore that the words of the Creed cannot be called "from without" the Creed, understanding "from without" in the sense of being from

outside the meaning; it is therefore necessary that you have understood "from without" in the second manner — namely that it is not from the proper word as it is placed in the Creed. But from this another incongruity follows: that the Creed made from the faith of Christ was made by addition — which you deny.

Nothing has been placed in the Creed by the councils which is found immediately in the Apostles' Creed. The Nicene Council declared *consubstantial* — which was not found in the Creed as to the words, nor did it follow immediately from anything posited in the Creed. For if it followed from something, it would be taken from "*begotten from the Father*"; but from this it does not follow absolutely — because Arius said: granted that the Father begot the Son, it does not follow therefore that He is consubstantial. For the sun generates a man, yet does not share substance with the man. It does not follow: "*begotten from the Father, therefore consubstantial*"; one must take that teaching of the Gospel, namely "*I and the Father are one*" (Jn. 10:30) — and from this consubstantiality is concluded. But such a manner of speaking, according to you, comes from without — therefore it is an addition.

The same applies to the Constantinopolitan Creed. For to say that the Holy Spirit is Lord and co-glorified (cf. Denzinger 86) — since there was no such expression in the Creed, nor does it follow immediately from anything, since it does not infer: "*Spirit, therefore Lord*" — yet those Fathers concluded that He is Lord and life-giver from the Gospel, taking the matter itself from the first principles; and yet according to you it would follow that this is by addition. And since what follows by addition is different from the first — how shall we save the saying of the Ephesian, who when asked by us why no mention was made of the Constantinopolitan Creed, said — and rightly — that it was the same? Which variation indeed could not stand, if that by the mediation of which something of declaration is introduced into the Creed is said to be from without.

Consider, I ask, the incongruity that would arise in the whole of philosophy from this: since in every science it happens that demonstrations are made which are made through the "*what it is to be*" of a thing, demonstrating a property of a proper subject — and since such "*what it is to be*" of a thing neither agrees in expression with the subject, nor in predicate, nor in concept, as Aristotle proves in the seventh book of the *Metaphysics* (cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, lib. X [recte VII], c. 8 = Didot

II, 593) — there follows this incongruity in philosophy: that the property of any subject would come about through what is from without, and that it inheres in the subject through what is from without — which is nonetheless false.

And I judge that you do not deny the teaching of the holy Fathers — especially those who have been approved by councils — for when they teach something about the Christian faith and religion, they will say nothing that is from without the faith. For since the teaching of Christians is subject to theology, when any doctor is cited, he is cited most pertinently, and in no way as something foreign. Among the number of those doctors is the blessed Basil, held in common esteem, who writing to his brother Gregory of Nyssa says: *"Whoever understands the Spirit, similarly understands and comprehends Him from whom He is; by the understanding of the Spirit, He too is understood whose Spirit it is. And since it is the Spirit of Christ, and when the Spirit is understood in the Creed, the Son is understood"* (Basil, *Epistola 38*, ad Gregorium Nyssenum = Migne PG 32, 325 A). From this it is given to be understood that that authority of the Savior — *"whatever the Father has, etc."* (cf. Jn. 16:15) — is not said to contain something from without; otherwise it would follow that all those things which the Fathers used in declaring the Creed were additions; and since they did not prohibit those additions, why should one and the same Creed not be said, and why in our case do we not say that to say the Spirit proceeds from the Son is to understand it proceeding immediately from the Father — which does not harm the faith and the Church, nor is it necessary, when something is said that is concluded in another which ought to be absolutely the same? Indeed it often happens that things agree in one respect and disagree in another — as genus with species. And although the one explaining the species has another expression, no philosopher would say that genus and species are correlative additions — and conversely, if they have it that with one posited another is understood, they are nonetheless distinguished in number, species, and terms.

Since therefore in our case the things are also of one substance, all the same except for the constitutive properties — I would not say: there is something from without, when one is inferred from another. I say therefore from these considerations that the proposition declaring the Holy Spirit to proceed from the Son can in no way be called "from without," if it is received from the words of Christ. And while you

receive with astonishment that we have said: from the principles of theology it will follow that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son — there is nothing to marvel at; but it is fitting that we ourselves marvel, if you receive it with astonishment. For by this single brief reasoning it is clearer than the sun: *whatever the Father has, the Son has; but to produce the Spirit the Father has; therefore the Son also has it.* This syllogism is in the first figure and the third mode; the antecedent and the major premise is conceded — in John, chapter **XV** (note: it should have been said chapter **XVI**) (cf. Jn. 16:15).

NICENE. We admit the authority of John, but that it be reduced to the sense you speak of — that we say is yours to assert.

COLOCENSIS. If the syllogism is admitted, the consequence cannot be denied.

NICENE. Say what you please, because we shall not respond to those things that do not bear on the present conclusion; but we profess this: that by this method we shall never arrive at a conclusion. We indeed shall patiently hear what is set forth, until you come to the proposition.

COLOCENSIS. Are not what I set forth the words of the Savior, and is the minor premise not confirmed by the evangelical text? Therefore the argument concludes through faith, unless you should wish to deny that these are principles of this kind. I shall clearly show that what has been said pertinently concerns the matter at hand.

NICENE. Say what you please, but we ask that it be in honorable words, and do not assert that we deny the principle of faith.

COLOCENSIS. I hoped you would give us thanks, if I were to demonstrate from the principles of the faith that the Spirit proceeds from the Son; I desired to do this so that you might render fitting gratitude.

NICENE. That is what we say — but as we asked in its proper time: that it be reserved is consonant with reason, so that both things might be preserved.

COLOCENSIS. I shall say what in your judgment is pertinent, and it is free to respond to what uncovers the truth. The Savior Himself also says that He proceeds from Him — for "*to receive from me*" (Jn. 16:15) is nothing other than the Spirit

proceeding from Him, as the blessed Epiphanius testifies, whose words are these. [Here a blank space of about one third of a page; in the margin: "*here a certain brief authority of Epiphanius is lacking*" V.] (cf. Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses*, lib. III, tom. 1, c. 4 = Migne PG 4, 480 D.)

And when you asserted that conclusions are not to be added to principles — and thus neither shall this expression be added to the Creed — we say that it is not absolutely true that conclusions are not to be given to principles; since in one discipline there come multiple principles: some that are not proved within it, either because they are self-evident as in metaphysics, or because they are proved in another discipline. There are others that can be demonstrated, and these can be both principles and conclusions — as in moral philosophy.

ANDREAS. With these things set forth, silence was made, and Lord Cardinal spoke thus.

CARDINAL. The hour has now come to rise and yield to the night. We have given a response to your question. Lord Colocensis did not relate the things you heard in order to respond to what was set forth, but because it seemed to him that you had taken what he said differently than seemed expedient — and so it seemed right that he declare himself. It remains for the scribes to meet on Saturday to receive our response.

NICENE. We say and shall say to your reverend paternity that our question consists in two things. First: whether your dogma is true or not; and with the truth found, whether it was lawful to add it to the Creed. It is indeed known to all that the latter precedes the former; for even given the dogma to be true, we say it was not lawful to add it. The manner of discussion held has been lengthy; it seems expedient, with the discussion of the truth of the dogma set aside, to come to the proposed matter — this seems fitting for this affair. For to those things that have been said, no satisfaction appears to have been given, nor a response to our question.

CARDINAL. Did I not give a pertinent and full response to the question?

NICENE. No. We awaited the response of your paternity, the satisfaction of the question — but that having been heard, we intended to confirm what we intend, had the words of Lord Colocensis not been an obstacle.

CARDINAL. When you have been speaking for two days — that the manner of speaking should be disturbed over one question, so as to alter the given form of speaking, is not just. On Saturday a response shall be given to what you have set forth; and then with parity observed, to brief questions let brief responses be given.

ANDREAS. With these things having been set forth, we all rose at the twenty-second hour.

[*Manuscript and editorial notes:*]

3: *Aghato* V. — 4: cf. Gill, pp. 153–10–11. — 5: *Aghato* V; *et ipse Aghato* V. — 6: cf. Gill, pp. 153–12–15, though there the name of Mark Eugenicus is placed. — 8: cf. Gill, pp. 153–2–154. — 10: cf. Gill, pp. 154–20–17; the words "et removeatur" do not depend further on the preceding causal sentence. — 12: *theotecon* V. — 13: cf. Gill, pp. 155–6–10. — 16: cf. Gill, pp. 155–13–29. — 19: *Aghato* V; *prohibere* V. — 19: *arithmeticum* V; *astrologum* V. — 20: *distinguntur* V. — 23: cf. Gill, pp. 156–3–15; 156–17–160. — 23: *E phiano* V; in the margin: "*here a certain brief authority of Epiphanius (read Epiphanius) is lacking*" V. — 24: Basil, *Epistola* 38, ad Gregorium Nyssenum = Migne PG 32, 325 A. — 24: *Nasasenum* V — read *Nyssenum*. — 25: *ottulit* V. — 26: *filius* V. — 27: cf. Jn. 16:15. — 27: *methaphysice* V. — 29: *prepositi* V; *premissi* V. — 30: *distinguntur* V. — 32: *obnixisse* V. — 33: The speech of Andreas the Archbishop of Colocensis was omitted by the Greek notaries, as they themselves confess; cf. Gill, pp. 160–29. — 33: The six deputies named at the session of 9 October 1438. — 35: *Theotecos* V. — 35: cf. Aristotle, *Analytica posteriora*, lib. I, c. 28 = Didot I, 149. — 36: cf. Gill, pp. 156–3–15. — 37: *cardinalis Iulianus Cesarini*. — 37: cf. Gill, pp. 160–3–9. — 38: *ea*] in V. — 39: *prepositionem* V. — 40: *prepositio* V. — 42: *pertinens ut* V. — 3: *sunt* V. — 3: cf. Jn. 16:15. — 5: note: it should have been said chapter XVI. — 7: *prepositi* V; *premissi* V. — 8: Denzinger 86, where however it reads: *dominum et vivificantem ... conglorificandum*. — 12: *testum* V. — 16: *conventu* V. — 17: cf.

Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, lib. X, c. 8 (not 7) = Didot II, 593. — 19: *per subiectum* V. — 22: cf. Jn. 16:15. — 23: cf. Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses*, lib. III, tom. 1, c. 4 = Migne PG 4, 480 D. — 24: *prepositio* V. — 26: *filius* V. — 27: *methafisica* V. — 33: cf. Mk. 16:15. — 35: *extrinsecum* V. — 36: *distinguntur* V. — 37: *discussionis* V; *discussione* V. — 39: *prepositionem* V. — Jn. 10:30. — Denzinger 86. — 13: *declarative* V.

COLLATIO VIII — 8 NOVEMBER

Opening and Preamble

The sacred assembly had gathered, and while all awaited who would give the exposition, the Bishop of Forlì, appointed third among the Latin delegates, began with these words.

BISHOP OF FORLÌ. To what has been said by you, reverend fathers of the East, I will first recall, by way of preamble, the three points proposed by you.

We heard, from the beginning of your discourse, that we ought not to insist or strive for one side to overcome the other, nor compete to surpass one another, but that our sole purpose should be to bring forth clearly and openly the pure and sincere truth of the faith into the open — which we ourselves fully approve and wish to follow with all care and diligence. For as Jerome says in a letter: "*Doubt that follows truth never errs; indeed, truth itself, and especially the divine truth of the holy faith, gathers and unites into one men very far apart in region, customs, and language, even those who are separated*" — just as that great worshipper, the Areopagite, makes clear in his book *On the Divine Names*, saying: "*Knowledge, divine faith, is the single foundation of believers, binding them together in truth.*" For it is the knowledge that aids those who know and those who are known.

Therefore, if we desire, intend, and strive for this holy union, we must pursue a real and steadfast purpose, so that, agreeing in the understanding of our souls, we may be united in the truth itself.

Second, you stated that whatever is to be treated and examined by reason among us should be handled with patience, gentleness, and calm. This produced great joy in my heart, so much so that I could say with the prophet — upon hearing this from

you, Lord of Nicaea: *"You have put gladness in my heart"* — for as Paul writes in his second letter to Timothy: *"The servant of the Lord must not quarrel, but be gentle to all, apt to teach, patient, with meekness,"* etc.

Third, you said that you intend to observe, and find it good and reasonable, that — as the proposition states — our responses and arguments should be brief, since brevity is both more easily grasped by the intellect and more readily committed to memory. This is agreeable, provided that the brevity is not such as to make things obscure, and that unintelligibility be avoided — for it is said: *"I become obscure when I labor to be brief."* I beg your reverend fatherhoods not to demand two impossibilities of me at once: namely, that I be brief and that I respond to everything you have said.

Response to the Principal Arguments

I will therefore respond to the principal matters and follow your order in replying.

First, you put forward — across the two preceding sessions — certain propositions. In this response, since it seems reasonable to us, we will concede some of the things you have said, deny others, and offering reasonable and just argument in the middle, we will clarify certain points; to some matters we will not give an extended response but a brief one, wrapped in a kind of covering. I do not doubt that you will most fittingly judge this to be the reasonable course of action. Following this, in the name of the Lord, I respond to these six principal statements.

Your proposition begins thus: *"When we have heard you, even regarding this part, we say that you have well observed the rule of preambles."* Then follows the beginning of our controversy: that the particle *filioque* is an addition made externally and consequently prohibited. You say literally: *"Even if it be true and correct, it is not permitted to add it, since many things that are true, necessary, and clarified have nonetheless not been added nor placed in the Creed, since this is not permitted."* And then, through the interjection of many arguments, which I shall summarize briefly, you conclude: since it has been demonstrated that addition is prohibited, and it has been proven that this is an addition, therefore it is prohibited in this matter.

The *Filioque* Is Not a Prohibited Addition

To this we wish to respond fully, and lest we seem to disregard your words, I say that in this interjection of arguments you first recall what was said by the reverend Lord Archbishop of Kolossi, and say that you wish to respond to what bears on the matter, reserving the rest for another time. You say you wish to respond and you repeat, saying that he used a certain syllogism — which is true — and that you wish to supplement the minor premise and respond to what he deduced through the continuation of that syllogism. You form the syllogism thus: *Every addition is made externally. But a declaration is not made externally. Therefore a declaration is not an addition.* Let us set this aside. The reverend Archbishop is an outstanding doctor and profound theologian, and he argued most excellently at the very outset of the controversy.

When you say that the particle *filioque* is an addition and that it is prohibited, we clearly contradict you by denying that it is prohibited, and we wish to clarify this through the statements of the saints and through reasonable explanations.

Virtual Containment: New Testament in Old

That it is not a pure and simple addition is made clear from the relation of virtual containment between the New and Old Testaments, and from the ordered succession in the expression of the articles of faith.

First, blessed Augustine in *Against Faustus* expressly says: "*Christ did not come to destroy the Law but to fulfil it — not so that things absent from the Law might be added to it, but so that what was written might come to pass, as his own words testify. For he does not say: 'Not one iota or one stroke shall pass from the Law unless what is lacking be added'; but he says: 'until all things come to pass.'*"

Likewise, from *On Catechizing*: "*In the Old Testament is the concealment of the New. In the New Testament is the manifestation of the Old.*" And in the *Questions on the Old and New Testaments*: "*When it is said in the Gospel: 'You have heard it said... but I say to you: do not resist evil' — he did not wish anything other than what the Law already held in its meaning.*" And on that passage in Ezekiel — "*a wheel within a wheel*" — Gregory says literally: "*A wheel within a wheel: the New*

Testament within the Old." Similarly, the Gloss on Matthew v: "*I came not to destroy the Law: the Gospel is a recapitulation of the ages*" — indeed, it cannot be prohibited, but the universal Church is always permitted...

Those fathers did what no sane person could fault as imperfect in faith. But if a license were given to add to the Creed however anyone wished, great harm could be inflicted upon the faithful, since through the alteration of syllables error could be introduced into the Church. This argument, with kind forbearance, we say limps somewhat — which we shall show in its proper place.

The Authority of Cyril and the Intent of the Legislators

Then follows the authority of Cyril and the argument. But since all of these are easily resolved once the foundation is overturned, I come to that very point. We therefore expressly assert that, since one must look more to the marrow than to the bark, and more to the principal intention of the legislator than to the surface of words and letters — and since that prohibition is a law of the Church — I say that it must be understood according to the intention of those who enacted and confirmed such a law.

Those fathers principally intended to prohibit the profession and faith that is contrary to, discordant with, and different from the faith of the fathers. And therefore the Lord Bonaventure says that, according to truth, by force of the meaning of the clause placed in the prohibition of the fathers, it does not extend except to those who contradict and to those who, with the intention of pouring in confusion, diversifying, and corrupting the pure and holy faith of the fathers, attempt — with that intention — to alter, add, or subtract a clause, addition, or syllable.

But this prohibition does not, in any age — even at the end — prohibit a general and legitimate council, lawfully convened with due authority and with the head and prince of the Church who holds in himself the universal fullness of power of the whole Church, from making, for legitimate causes and to counter emerging errors and heresies, a new declaration of some part of the Creed — one consonant with the faith of the fathers — and placing it in the Creed.

And who in his right mind would doubt that, if there were a pressing necessity such that a great multitude of Christians were falling into heresy concerning the sacrament of the altar, the Church could not — just as it was added to the Creed by the fathers: *"I confess one baptism for the remission of sins"* — add: *"I confess the sacrament of the Eucharist for the salvation of souls,"* and the word *Theotokos* as it seemed necessary, saying: *"and was incarnate of the Virgin Mary, who is truly Theotokos, and was made man"*?

We do, however, affirm that no private person, private congregation, or private church would be permitted to do this. And we say two things: that that prohibition must be referred to private individuals, and to those who would attempt it with wicked intent. As the Lord Bonaventure says: *"It was not the intention of those fathers who made this prohibition to close the way to other fathers of the Church following them from making a greater explanation of the faith, should God illuminate them more and they see it to be necessary."* Indeed, Bonaventure says more: *"that if they had said it with that intention, it is clear they would not have been well motivated and their sentence would deservedly be abolished."*

Evidence from the Acts of the Councils

But that those fathers, in that prohibition, held the sound and right intention we have described — this we wish to show from what we have in the acts of the holy councils, especially the Third Synod, and from the examples of the fathers who lived at that time.

When the bishops had assembled at Ephesus and Nestorius had been summoned but remained contumacious, they declared that, according to custom, the faith of the fathers of Nicaea should be read, so that — comparing the statements on faith with that exposition — those consonant with it would be confirmed and those discordant would be ejected. Hence it is clear that the intention of the synod is that the faith which is true — not that which is discordant — be approved. And from this it is clear what those words signify: *"Let no one be permitted to put forward another faith"* than what has been definitively established — that is, one that is discordant and contrary.

On the Letter of Celestine and the Apostles' Creed

When you say that it was prohibited to add, it is replied: since you yourselves admit that it is prohibited and subject to penalty to add or subtract from the apostolic faith — even from the Apostles' Creed — as Celestine himself clearly explains; but notwithstanding this prohibition, certain things were added to and removed from the Apostles' Creed through the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds — for instance, "*he descended into hell*" — and yet this is not reproved below.

And yet Celestine reproves Nestorius, whom he says subtracted something from the Apostolic Creed — namely, *Dei Genitrix* ("Mother of God") — which, however, is not explicitly but implicitly contained in the Apostolic Creed. The reason for this is that the Nicene, Constantinopolitan, and other synods added nothing to and subtracted nothing from the apostolic faith against its sound understanding and against truth; but Nestorius did. From this it appears that one is prohibited from adding or subtracting when one does so against the true understanding or adds or subtracts something against the right faith.

And from this, every difficulty is resolved which you, fathers of the Eastern Church, raise against the Latins who added *filioque*. They did not add it against the true understanding of the Constantinopolitan Creed, nor against truth or the right faith — especially since it was publicly stated that the Constantinopolitan and Nicene Creeds are the same, and that when one is read, the other is understood as well, for though they differ in words they do not differ in meaning and truth. And so we say that the Roman Creed is one with the Constantinopolitan and Nicene Creeds, and when those are read, this too is understood; and it is permitted to add this word, since it does not diverge from the true meaning and the right faith.

And because what agrees in meaning differs only in words, it follows that it is not properly an addition, but one and the same thing — an expression of identity.

There follows in the letter of Celestine: "*Among the many things impiously preached which the universal Church refuses, we lament that these words have been removed from the creed handed down by the apostles — words which promise*

us all hope of life and salvation" — namely, that the blessed Mary is the Mother of God, which was virtually present in the Apostles' Creed.

From this it is clear that it is not permitted to subtract from the Apostles' Creed — and yet the fathers of Nicaea did subtract from it, namely *"he descended into hell."* And those who subtracted it were not denying that truth or attacking it, as Nestorius attacked the truth that Mary was the Mother of God. Celestine then admonishes Nestorius that unless within ten days he retracts his error and preaches of Christ what the universal Church holds, let him know himself to be cut off from the communion of the Church.

I could say many more things from the acts of the councils. But our discourse hastens to further matters.

Returning to the Main Argument

Let us return to the point from which we digressed slightly with regard to the progress of your argument — though we have not departed from the main proposition, as is clearly evident.

We were saying that regarding the principal foundation upon which you base your contradiction — adducing the motivations of the fathers — your argument limps somewhat, and indeed it does.

You argue thus: *"If it is not permitted to add to the Creed, no harm can be inflicted upon the faithful."*

I say this is false. If it is not permitted to the universal Church or to the prince of the Church — in whom resides the fullness of power and authority of the whole Church — then if it had not been permitted to the fathers of the Church to add to the Apostles' Creed as generated by Christ, the Church would have suffered great harm; and likewise if it had not been permitted to other councils.

On the License to Add and the Fear of Syllables

And when you add in the argument that, given a license for anyone to add to the Creed, harm could be inflicted upon the faithful — since through the alteration of

syllables, error could be introduced into the Church — and you seem greatly to fear these syllables, we say that you step away from the middle and leap from one extreme to the other, as if it were necessary to choose one of two options: either that this license be denied to all, even to the universal Church and universal synods, or that it be granted indiscriminately to every private individual. You say literally: "*Given the license for anyone to add to the Creed, harm will follow.*" We say that this need not be so, nor has it ever been licit for all; but rather the praiseworthy and honest middle course is this: that this license not be granted to individual persons, and yet that it not in the least be taken away from the prince of the universal Church.

Third Argument: The Authority of Cyril to Acacius

Third, you argue from the authority of Cyril to Acacius, where he says: "*The holy and ecumenical synod which convened at Ephesus necessarily provided that no other exposition of the faith should be introduced in the Church of God beyond what exists — what our venerable fathers, who spoke in the Holy Spirit, determined concerning the faith.*"

And you note the prohibitory elements. **First**, that the Third Synod prohibited addition; yet the text does not say this; it says: that no other faith should be brought into the Church of God.

Second, you note that it provided *necessarily* — and for the necessity of salvation, by which the most pious and solicitous mother the Church, against imminent dangers and against rising heresies, provides as best she can for an opportune remedy.

Lord of Nicaea, you note and say — as if using a rhetorical inversion — that it is not *another faith's exposition* that is prohibited, but *another exposition of the same faith*. To which we say: we simply deny the first part of what you say, namely that this other expression of the faith — that is, an exposition diverging from the faith of the fathers — is not prohibited. On the contrary, it always has been and always will be prohibited to hold another faith. The second part, however, which follows the letter of Cyril and by which another exposition of the faith is prohibited, we concede; but it must be understood thus: *another exposition of the faith* — namely

one that is diverse, discordant, and divergent from the exposition of the fathers — is prohibited.

Exchange Regarding the Text of Cyril's Letter

CARDINAL. Fathers, we have a doubt, because you cite certain words in the letter of Cyril which we do not have in the same form; we would wish to see it — let the text be read in Greek.

ANDREAS. Rising from among the Latins, he read the letter with these words: *"Cyril, to rejoice in the Lord. The greeting of a brother is indeed sweet, worthy of effort, and deserving of all consideration,"* etc.

NICENUS. We do not have that letter. But what we have is addressed: *"To my lord Agathon,"* etc., and begins thus: *"Deeply and persistently wounded,"* etc.

CARDINAL. And in this letter there are certain things contrary to the reading of your letter.

NICENUS. If they are contrary, they are contrary to Cyril, not to us.

CARDINAL. The point is that Cyril was here brought in to expound the faith to certain monks troubled by a bad exposition of the faith. Hence Cyril appears to hold that when the faithful are troubled, it is permitted to make a good exposition of the faith. But a bad one is prohibited by these words. Also, the letter to the monks distributed throughout Egypt and Alexandria — on account of what Nestorius had set forth — gave a correct exposition of the faith. And because of this, Nestorius rebels, sends messengers, and gathers certain gamblers and desperate men.

NICENUS. We do not have that one, but we believe it is not contrary to the others. We have here three letters to Acacius: one treats of the sacrifice called among the ancients *apompeianon* (*the scapegoat sacrifice*), and begins: *"Your letter..."*

ANDREAS. The Lord of Forlì continued.

Fourth Argument: Theotokos and the Two Natures

BISHOP OF FORLÌ. Fourth — regarding the third principal foundation, from which you argued by plausibility (*verisimile*) — since from the beginning of the Church it was prohibited to introduce contrary dogmas, therefore the synod prohibits something else, namely the alteration of words and syllables. But these syllables need not be so feared; this has been resolved in the overturning of your foundation.

NICENUS. We fear where there is cause for fear.

BISHOP OF FORLÌ. What was said there is that the addition of syllables and words is prohibited for those who would do so with the intent of overturning the faith. Moreover, it is not incongruous to renew the same prohibition at different times. Indeed, blessed Paul the Apostle in **Galatians i** states the same prohibition and repeats it, saying: *"Even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you a gospel other than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed"*; and there it follows: *"As we have said before, so now I say again: if anyone preaches to you a gospel other than what you have received, let him be accursed."*

There follows the fourth principal matter: a certain corroboration concerning the word *Theotokos* and concerning the two natures and operations in Christ — to demonstrate which truth you said the fathers of the Sixth Council had convened; and although these were contained in the Creed, they were not set forth so clearly there, and yet the fathers did not wish to place them in the Creed. From this you infer the following: that nothing should be added to the Creed — neither what is already clearly and openly contained in it, nor what is not so clearly contained. And you confirm this by noting that all the councils that followed the Third preserved this — namely the Fourth, the Fifth, the Sixth, and the Seventh.

To this we respond: this does indeed imply that something new should not easily or without great necessity be expressed in the common Creed of the faith; but it does not follow that this cannot be done by the universal Church for necessary causes, and by the prince of that Church who holds in himself the power of the whole Church — as was said above.

And because you wish to infer that we ought to have placed that particle elsewhere — in the common Creed of the faith — but not in the Creed itself, and that this

would have been lawful; and because of this you seem to concede a certain license by saying that all those fathers rightly attributed the place for declarations and expositions — namely that they be written in private codices, not placed in the Creed —

here we contradict you, grounding ourselves in large part on what you yourselves have conceded. In one part of your proposition you say that the Creed itself is to be held in great reverence because all professors of the faith were baptized in it — and from this you infer that we ought to have placed it in private codices. We draw the opposite and just inference: because what is placed in private codices does not so easily come to the knowledge of simple people being baptized as what is in the Creed. Indeed, simple people might have believed it was not true, precisely because the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son was not sung as publicly in the common Creed as the procession from the Father.

The Fifth Principal Argument: The Works of the Fathers

There follows the **v** principal point, where you say: "*The works of the fathers cry out more clearly than the sun, and their actions are in harmony.*" For since there were many necessities, they applied the remedy by means of declarations set forth in private documents, yet did not place them in the Creed. We say, as above, that from this it is well inferred that a new expression ought not to be made in the Creed without easy cause, unless an imminent and urgent grave necessity is pressing. But that it could not be done when the appropriate and requisite circumstances concur — this is simply denied and has been denied repeatedly.

As for the excuse you make — that the authority of Master Gregory does not bear on our proposition — we shall demonstrate well that the contrary is true, and be not troubled, for I shall speak with good charity.

The Sixth Principal Argument: Logic and the *Filioque*

The **vi** principal point of yours is a certain objection against the argument of my lord the Archbishop of Kolossi, where you object thus — when he was arguing from the dissimilarity of voice and idiom in the proof of the Creed among the Greeks and Latins. You respond and then object, or at least you attempt to, saying

thus: *"In this very difficulty of yours, we say that not only are there various voices and words, but indeed things different in meaning; for every word has its own meaning. For to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and that he proceeds from the Father and the Son, are two different propositions; wherefore you seem to argue logically and subtly and to infer that these are two propositions of different meaning — namely, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and that he proceeds from the Father and the Son — because you seem to want it to be a proposition by itself, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone. But to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son are two things joined by one copula, and thus one proposition, though with an additional term only."*

Refutation Using Proper Logical Terms

I wish to use proper logical terms, without concern for rhetoric. You claim it is one proposition, and then you wish to infer that they are diverse propositions because they have diverse contradictories — for to this proposition: *"the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father,"* the contradicting categorical proposition is: *"the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father."*

And although you do not place this particular in your text, it must be understood implicitly, so that your argument may be clear to logicians. And then you wish that to the copulative proposition — namely, *"the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son"* — there correspond these two contradictory negatives, of which one is false according to both of us. The proposition *"he proceeds from the Father and the Son"* has one corresponding negative, namely its contradicting proposition: *"the Spirit does not proceed from the Father nor from the Son"* — which negative has two parts, of which one is false according to both of us, namely that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father. The other is true according to you, namely that the Spirit does not proceed from the Son.

I do not intend to reproach you, but since it is written in Ecclesiasticus **i** that both friends being present should love holy truth, and it is written in the mouth of the philosophers: *"Plato is a friend, but truth is a greater friend"* — I say therefore in response to your argument: **first**, because you employ logic, I say with reverence that you do not employ true logic. You assume what is false and speak against the rules of logic when you say that this affirmative — *"the Spirit proceeds from the*

Father and the Son" — has one negative, namely *"the Spirit does not proceed from the Father nor from the Son."* With all due reverence: it is not so.

The contradictory of a single affirmative copulative is not a copulative formed from contradicting parts; rather, it is a disjunctive formed from contradicting parts. For otherwise — if it were not so — two contradictories mutually contradicting one another would both be false at the same time, which is not true; this cannot occur in any branch of knowledge.

I prove the assumption and take this example: *"This man is a stone"* and *"man is an animal."* If the contradictory of the former were a copulative formed from the contradicting parts of the affirmative — namely, *"man is not a stone nor is he an animal"* — it is clear that not both are false: namely, *"man is a stone"* is false, and likewise the other copulative, *"man is not a stone nor is he an animal,"* is also false, because it has one false part — namely, *"man is not an animal."*

But I wish to take a clearer example in divine matters. I take this copulative, which is false: *"the Son proceeds from the Father and proceeds from the Holy Spirit."* If the proposition contradicting this is: *"the Son does not proceed from the Father nor from the Holy Spirit"* — this too is false, because it has one false part, namely that the Son does not proceed from the Father. And then it is inferred against you from your own words that you are compelled to deny two contradictories mutually contradicting one another as two false propositions. For you deny this: *"the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son,"* and you are likewise compelled to deny this: *"the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father and from the Son."* Therefore, if your argument is sound, let it be seen what follows.

ANDREAS. At these words he smiled, and then continued.

Further Clarification and Logical Defense

BISHOP OF FORLÌ. You hear, reverend lords and fathers — I would not have entered into logical material had you not entered it first, but it was necessary to do so. Now, however, I wish to resolve the argument of your theology and to defend the honor of the reverend father the Lord Archbishop of Kolossi in truth, for in that part he was arguing most excellently.

When you, reverend fathers, say that this is a different proposition and has a different meaning — namely: "*the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son,*" as distinct from: "*the Spirit proceeds from the Father*" — because one is verified in a different way than the other and one has a different contradictory than the other, we concede this and it is most true, and it is not against us, as I shall immediately make clear.

But if by "different" you understand that it is altogether unrelated, and that one cannot be closely derived from the other by those who understand well, this we deny entirely, and your argument from the fact that one proposition contradicts one and another contradicts another does not hold.

For example — by analogy — **first**: in the Apostles' Creed, regarding the article on the Son, it was said: "*And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.*" But to counter the heresy of the Arians, the fathers of Nicaea said: "*begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father*" — yet these two propositions are verified in different ways and have different contradictories. For Arius would have denied the contradictory of the first — namely: "*And in Jesus Christ, the only Lord our Lord*" — and would have conceded the contradictory of the second, because he denied *consubstantial with the Father*.

Likewise, in the article on the Holy Spirit, the Apostles' Creed states no more than: "*I believe in the Holy Spirit.*" But afterwards the fathers added: "*Lord and life-giver, and proceeding from the Father*" — and yet it is clear that one proposition is verified differently from the other, and the contradicting proposition of one differs from that of the other. Notwithstanding this, because the fathers saw that from one, by a proper deduction, the other follows, they expressed these things — namely, *begotten, not made, consubstantial*, etc. — and placed them in the Creed.

And so it must be understood harmoniously regarding the procession from the Son, where the words of the Lord Archbishop of Kolossi are especially vindicated, when he was arguing from principles and conclusions. I have no doubt that you know that conclusions and truths following from principles are of two kinds: some truths are very remote from their principles and cannot be inferred except through many intermediary steps; but some truths are very close to their principles, so close

that they seem self-evidently and easily deducible from what is self-evident, as though inferred by an imperceptible syllogism — arguing thus: *"Everything that contains as much as its part is greater than its part; every whole is of this kind; therefore..."* Similarly, see the example from nature: Aristotle says at the beginning that it is ridiculous to try to demonstrate that nature exists — where the commentators and doctors note that Aristotle significantly does not say it is ridiculous to demonstrate that nature exists, but rather that it is ridiculous to *try* to demonstrate it. The reason is that this deduction — showing that nature is so — is made so easily, in a kind of imperceptible syllogism, that to strive toward it as toward something imperceptible, since it is already known, is ridiculous.

The Lord of Kolossi Was Right

Now the Lord of Kolossi was speaking well when he said that the truth — that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, and that he proceeds from the Son — does not belong to the number of those truths that are most remote from their principles and cannot be inferred except through many intermediate steps, but rather belongs to those that are very close to their principles and are deduced from them with the greatest ease.

And therefore the fathers at Nicaea, because they saw that this truth — namely, that the Son is consubstantial, not made but from eternity — could easily be deduced from the article on the Son placed in the Apostles' Creed, therefore without any fear of offending the Apostles' Creed they joyfully and with all confidence proclaimed *consubstantial*, etc.

And so they did with this article on the Holy Spirit: because they saw that *the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father* could easily be deduced, they did not fear the Apostles' Creed — which had said only *"I believe in the Holy Spirit"* — and boldly added: *"Lord and life-giver, and proceeding from the Father."*

And similarly the Latins are said to have been inclined — seeing that the procession of the Spirit from the Son could be deduced with the greatest ease from what the Apostles and the Nicene fathers had said.

And with the permission of our lord, I will complete the response on another day.

Closing Exchange

ANDREAS. When these things had been set forth, each man looked at the other, reflecting on what they had heard — spoken most eloquently and with weighty words by that elder man, with language most fitting and pleasing.

NICENUS. What your paternity has said, we have heard with charity, as you put it forward, and we were troubled by none of it. We give thanks to your paternity both for what you said and for the manner in which you said it, for everything was most gratifying to hear. But we trust the responses you receive on the next day will be even more gratifying.

ANDREAS. When these things had been set forth, as evening had now come, each man rose, with the bishops rising first.

ACTUS NONUS — 11 NOVEMBER

Opening: Continuation by the Bishop of Forlì

The ninth session took place on the eleventh of November. After the sacred rites had been celebrated on the **xi** of November, at the ninth session of the assembly, while everyone stood with attentive ears, the Bishop of Forlì, who had delivered the speech at the previous session, continued with these words.

BISHOP OF FORLÌ. By the grace of God and with the blessing of our lord, I will be today most brief and most clear. On Saturday, reverend fathers, we concluded our speeches at that part of your address where you were objecting, saying that in the proposition "*the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father*" and in that other proposition "*the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son*," there are not only different voices and words, but indeed things different in meaning, etc. — you have heard what we said, and several have written it down. Let us proceed to further matters.

Six Points on Principles

There follow in your proposition these six things which you say concerning principles. You say thus: "*A principle and what follows from a principle are in most things distinct, and perhaps in all things*" — and you adduce a proof by setting forth three differences between a principle and what follows from it.

First: a principle is universal; what follows is particular.

Second: a principle is that which demonstrates; what follows is that which is demonstrated.

Third: a principle is a proposition; what follows are conclusions.

From this you argue: in what way would it come about that particulars become universals, demonstrable things become demonstrative, and conclusions become propositions?

The **ii** principal point you set forth as follows: that principles should have what follows from them is necessary; but that things be added to principles is not necessary.

The **iii** you deduce in these words: if there were any prohibition against this, as in our present difficulty, then this would be far more difficult to bring about, since many things that are true have not been added to the principles.

Fourth, you make the following inference, saying thus: the dogmas of the faith are taken from the dogmas of the Scriptures, which dogmas are the principles.

Fifth, you infer that since nothing has been added to the principles of Holy Scripture, neither shall we add anything during the period of the prohibition.

Sixth, you draw a corollary, thus: from which it necessarily follows that, granted that the Creed of the faith holds and has the place of a principle in the Church of God, what follows from it is in no way to be added to the Creed itself.

Response: Agreements and Disagreements on the Nature of Principles

I have set forth your exposition faithfully, reverend fathers, though I have organized it by numbering its parts, so that I may respond in an orderly fashion. To which we say, **first**, that — as we said on Saturday in responding to the statements — what is true we will accept, what does not appear to be true we will openly deny with reason, and what is ambiguous and obscure we will strive to open up and clarify.

When you say **first**, speaking about principles of doctrine, that a principle and what follows from it are in most things distinct, and perhaps in all — we concede without doubt that they are distinct in most things; but that they are distinct *in all things* we simply deny. Lord of Nicaea, attend carefully. For that adverb "*perhaps*" is, according to grammarians, an adverb of doubt — and you should not be in doubt, but rather be certain that a principle and what follows from it are not distinct in all things, nor do they disagree in all things.

Consider: for they agree in at least three respects — namely in truth, in the genus of doctrine, and in the relation of ordered inference. For what follows from principles is true and is demonstrated to be true from the truth of the principles. Hence that passage from the first book of the *Posterior Analytics*: "*it is necessary that demonstrative reasoning proceed from true principles by means of clarification; therefore what is known must be true, since it is not possible to know what does not exist — as that the diagonal is commensurable, since this is not so. Hence of necessity a principle of doctrine and what follows from it agree in truth*" — for from what is truly real, what is not true does not truly follow. And therefore the prophet David, in order to show the truth in all the words of God, says literally: "*The beginning of your words is truth.*"

Second, they agree in genus of doctrine: from a geometric principle follow geometric conclusions, from a physical principle follow physical conclusions, and so on.

Third, they agree in the relation of ordered inference. For though it is possible to come to knowledge of what follows from knowledge of the principle — and this process from the principle is *a priori* — sometimes it goes the other way, and this is the process *a posteriori*. And therefore it is written at the beginning of the *Ethics*: "*Let it not escape you that reasonings from principles differ*" — and Plato rightly debated and inquired whether the way was from principles or toward principles, as in a racecourse toward the finish line or the reverse. For the three differences you have placed between principles and what follows from principles, for now we do not trouble ourselves to contradict them, though we could raise some difficulties.

On Necessity and Truth

But from the **ii** principal statement, where you say that what principles contain in what follows from them is necessary, but that we add things is not necessary — from this it is inferred thus: every necessary condition is prior to what is not necessary; but according to you, that principles have what follows from them is necessary, and thus it is necessary that the truth of a conclusion be contained in and held by the principles. But that things be added is not necessary; therefore what follows from principles is true prior to being added or needing to be added. For by the order of nature, a proposition is true prior to being licit or illicit. Hence the Gospel was true in itself prior to being preachable or readable. And so this proposition — "*the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son*" — is true prior to its being added. For what belongs to something necessarily, of itself, and without relation to anything external, belongs to it prior to what belongs to it through a relation to something external.

You say the contrary. You say thus: "*It is necessary, finally, that we begin from what nature itself makes evident.*" Such a principle is what you put forward. You asked from the beginning of the collation held in this assembly why we made that addition of *filioque* and whether it was lawful to do so — and yet by the order of nature it was first necessary to see whether it is true before asking whether it is lawful or prohibited. For according to all true

theologians, what belongs to God intrinsically is prior to what belongs to God by relation to something external. For example: it is prior that the Holy Spirit be with the Son and from the Son and of the being from the Son, than that it be lawful or prohibited to add this.

The Latin Addition Is Not Extrinsic

Therefore when one takes such a major premise — *"all that belongs to the Father belongs to the Son"* — and proves it from a word of the Gospel or the letters of Paul or any other part of Holy Scripture, such a proof or declaration must in no way be called outside the doctrine of the faith or outside the doctrine divinely revealed, nor should it be called extrinsic. On the contrary, since it is made from the proper principles of the doctrine of the faith — since you concede that the Scriptures themselves are the principles — it follows well that this proof, declaration, or explication must in no way be called extrinsic.

Hence, as we were saying yesterday: just as in the article on the Father it was not expressly contained that he was *"maker of visible and invisible things,"* and in the article on the Son the phrase *"begotten not made, consubstantial"* etc. is not contained in the form of the words — the Apostles' Creed saying only *"and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord"* — to counter the error of the Manicheans in the article on the Father and the error of the Arians in the article on the Son, the fathers expressed and appended from the Apostles' Creed the things that were added to the Creed, because they saw that all of these could evidently be drawn from the principles of the faith — namely the Holy Scriptures and from the Gospel of John: *"In the beginning was the Word"* and *"I and the Father are one"* — and they did not think that making such an extension and declaration from the apostles and of the apostles and placing it in the Creed was to go outside or to be called extrinsic.

Similarly, afterwards, other fathers of another synod, to counter the heresy of the Macedonians and all those who were saying that the Spirit was a creature, made this explication, extension, and declaration in the article on the Holy Spirit of the apostles and appended it to the Creed: *"in the Holy*

Spirit, life-giver, and proceeding from the Father" — because they saw they could deduce this from the Gospel of John and the letter of John. Hence they did not believe such an explication to be extrinsic or to be called extrinsic.

To the point, Lord of Nicaea, and I shall speak courteously. We Latins say that if this declaration and explication of the same article on the Holy Spirit — namely that he proceeds not only from the Father but also from the Son — can be deduced from the Gospel and the letters of Paul, well understood and clarified, or from another part of Scripture, then such an extension or explication must not be called extrinsic; indeed it must not properly even be called an addition, on the given condition that it is evidently deduced from the proper principles of the faith — namely from the Holy Scriptures. This, by the grace of God, we hope to demonstrate clearly when it shall please God and our most holy lord. But for now, in order to accommodate you, we do not enter into that depth.

On the Authority of the Church

As for your conclusion that, granted that the Creed of the faith holds and has the place of a principle in the Church of God, what follows from it is in no way to be added to the Creed itself — you place the ground for this in the preceding statement, saying: nothing was added to the principles of Holy Scripture, nor shall we add anything. In response to your words, my reverend lord the Archbishop of Kolossi gave a good and excellent answer.

Regarding your **viii** principal point — from which the solution to the preceding follows — he spoke thus, and it does not seem to me that it can be resolved otherwise; so effective did this argument of the Lord of Kolossi seem in its formulation. Since the Church of God is one and the same, it is necessary that it always have one and the same authority. To this argument you respond by saying: for the Church to have such authority, it is necessary that the Church itself preserve and keep unchanged everything that was handed down in such a way by the preceding fathers. You said certain things which we do not say.

ANDREAS. I in Greek and you in Latin—

BISHOP OF FORLÌ. These will be seen in due time. Listen: we say confidently and without hesitation that no faithful person should doubt the fullness of the authority of the Church, which the Savior expressed in Matthew **xviii**: *"But if he will not hear the Church, let him be to you as a heathen and a tax collector."* And again in the Gospel: *"He who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me."* And it is also an explicit article of faith both in the Apostles' Creed and in the Nicene Creed — indeed, fittingly, immediately after the article on the Holy Spirit is placed the article on the Church, the Apostles' Creed saying: *"I believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy catholic Church,"* and likewise in the second — namely in the Creed of the fathers, immediately after the article on the Holy Spirit follows: *"and one holy catholic Church."*

And if one asks, in this article, where mention is made of the Church's authority, it is said that it is there, when it sets forth its gift, calling it holy and catholic and apostolic. We say to the point that the Church which concurs in these times has always preserved unchanged the faith of the ancient fathers — as Augustine says: *"the times have changed, but not the faith"* — and it will preserve unchanged the Creed, the unchanged sacraments, and the unchanged volume of the divine Holy Scriptures. For the fathers at Nicaea, when they expressed *"maker of visible and invisible things"* and *"begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father,"* etc., are in no way to be said to have corrupted or altered the Apostles' Creed or to have professed a different faith from that of the apostles. And similarly those fathers who afterwards expressed in the Creed, in the article on the Holy Spirit, *"Lord and life-giver, proceeding from the Father,"* are in no way to be said to have altered either the faith of the preceding fathers or their Creed — even though they made a fuller implicit explication from evident and reasonable cause and pressing necessity, namely to counter the errors and heresies then being sown against the truth and majesty of the Holy Spirit.

And to dispatch the matter briefly: the Church of the Latins is in no way to be said to have varied or altered the faith of the fathers or the Creed of the faith. From evident and reasonable necessity it made that further

expression *filioque*; and therefore, just as that argument of yours would not hold if someone had made it against the Nicene and Constantinopolitan fathers — saying: either these conclusions must be set out in Holy Scripture or your addition must be removed from the Creed — so too the same argument referred against us does not hold.

Final Objection: On the Roman Church's Authority

Lastly, what the Lord of Nicaea added on Tuesday as a complement in these two principal conclusions: he objected thus — if the Roman Church was moved by authority and necessity, we say that necessity is in no way an impediment to the definitions of the holy fathers, provided that this is not expressly contained in them — that is, with the exception of necessity.

Here we say that some clauses are so firmly embedded in constitutions and so fittingly understood implicitly that even if they are not expressed, they are always understood according to true *epieikeia* (equitable interpretation). And this is one of them — namely, "*except in the case of necessity*" — which is closed by no law, rightly understood.

And when you touch superficially on the authority of the Roman Church, wishing to make a more profound treatment of it, and when you say truly that you would have much to say about the authority of the Roman Church, etc. — you then infer from the same place that such a license as to add to the Creed, you except both from the ecumenical councils and from the universal Church, let alone from the Roman Church. Here we respond and say that such liberty and authority can be taken away neither by the Roman Church, nor by us, nor by the preceding fathers. For she holds it by divine right.

Hence, accommodating you and not entering deeply into this matter or departing from our principal proposition, we say that this authority of the Roman Church is evidently gathered from the Gospel of John, when our Savior committed to Peter the care of the entire Christian flock, saying: "*If you love me, feed my sheep, feed my lambs.*" And this authority is clearly manifest through the fathers who convened at the Council of

Constantinople and other ancient councils, and through Athanasius, and through Agathon and that letter which was confirmed by the entire synod — in which it is expressly said that the faith of the Roman Church must be observed by all ecumenical councils and by the universal Church. It is also clear through Saint Jerome, the excellent disciple of your theologian Gregory. For in the profession of faith which he makes to Pope Damasus, he says: *"This is the faith itself, most blessed, which we learned in the catholic Church, which we have always held; and if in it something has perhaps been placed somewhat incautiously, we desire to have it corrected by you, who hold both the faith and the see of Peter. But if this our confession shall be approved by the judgment of your apostolate, then whoever wishes to find fault with me will prove himself ignorant, malevolent, or not catholic but heretical."*

Nor should it be wondered at, most learned fathers, that the judgment on faith is decreed to be referred to the first prince of the faithful in the state of mortals. For since the faith of the whole Church must be one and the same — as the Apostle wishes in I Corinthians I, saying: *"I beseech you, fathers, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you, but that you be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment"* — and therefore it is necessary that what is to be held by all as certain and defined in matters of faith be determined by one and the same prince of the Church.

Now, since some take it ill that I, among you Greek fathers, cite our Latin doctors, I say that I do so justly and reasonably — because I do not speak only to you Greeks, but also before Latins, as is evident; and I do not take it ill when you cite yours, both because they were most learned and most illumined in the divine Scriptures, and because they are cited in the ecumenical synods. Hence what they affirm is not set forth so meagerly and thinly that it does not render things credible — indeed, things worthy of belief — for they themselves prove these things by the authorities of Holy Scripture and by most fitting arguments. These words are spoken with the patience of the listener and with the indulgence and piety of the speaker — say whatever you wish.

Closing Exchange

ANDREAS. The words had been spoken so cheerfully and pleasantly, and with such fitting language, that everyone gave the highest praise to the aforementioned father. Then, after a brief silence, the Cardinal spoke thus.

CARDINAL. Because many things have been said on both sides subtly and elegantly — which are perhaps better understood by theologians and by those who are skilled in Holy Scripture than by laypeople and those not so skilled — I would have certain very plain things to say on this matter, which would be understood not only by the learned but also by laypeople; and unless I am mistaken, I think they will resolve this entire question. However, since today the assembly has been arranged for verbal disputations, let it be left to the choice of the Greek fathers whether they wish to hear these things or to hold disputations in words.

NICENUS. Let your lordship say whatever you please.

The Cardinal on the Prohibition of the Council of Ephesus

CARDINAL. I will touch on the root of this doubt. The question concerns the words of the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus — namely those words: *"let no one be permitted to teach, expound, or hold another faith."* We say that these words are to be understood as meaning that no one is permitted to put forward a faith contrary to the Nicene faith. They say that it is to be understood not only of another faith as such, but of any exposition whatsoever — even a true one — and that this prohibition encompasses every addition and declaration in the Creed.

Those who study in the laws say that a law cannot be settled except by examining the whole law. Hence it is necessary that we look at certain other things that precede this law. Before the fathers had come to that prohibition, a certain Charisius reported that Anastasius and Photius, disciples of Nestorius, had sent a certain James to preach the creed of Nestorius. And this James seduced others and gave them another creed of faith — indeed, as Charisius says, he gave them a *"creed of perfidy."* And

among other things, Charisius said that this James and others were accusing him of not holding the true faith. Hence Charisius said in the synod: I will read my faith and then the Nestorian one. First he recited his own faithful creed of faith — yet it is not the same creed as the Nicene or the Constantinopolitan.

NICENUS. On the contrary, it is the very same.

CARDINAL. These words are in the creed of Charisius: *"and the Spirit of truth,"* etc. These are not in the Nicene Creed.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Then only that creed of Nestorius was read.

CARDINAL. Charisius read the profession of his own faith and then that of Nestorius. This is a question of fact; it can be examined afterwards.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Charisius read his faith, but not by way of a creed.

CARDINAL. It was read in the form of a creed.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Charisius did not recite the profession of his own faith.

CARDINAL. Read the book.

ANDREAS. It was read there by the aforementioned reverend lord with these words: *"But they removed me as a heretic — I who retain the dogmas of piety, as will now be apparent. I believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of all visible things, etc., of the same substance with the Father, etc., born of Mary, etc. And in the Spirit of truth, consubstantial with the Father and the Son, etc."* Having read this, the Cardinal spoke thus.

CARDINAL. Note that he removes certain things from the Nicene Council, for the phrase *"there was a time when he was not"* is not present, and he introduces the matter of consubstantiality with the Father and the Son, which is in neither the Constantinopolitan nor the Nicene Creed. Then he read the Nestorian creed, calling it a *"creed of perfidy."* Afterwards the synod said that no one is permitted to hold another faith than that which is

in Nicaea; and afterwards it repudiates those who believe in the exposition of the creed as transformed by the Arians, but does not repudiate the faith of Charisius. Hence if the intention of the synod had been to prohibit any profession of faith, and if it had not wanted any other creed to be spoken except in the form of the Nicene Creed, it would certainly have repudiated the profession of faith of Charisius. But because Charisius was professing the truth, it did not disapprove of anything in his words — indeed, by repudiating the Nestorian creed, it follows that those words "*another faith*" signify a faith other than Nicaea, that is a false one. And this appears to be a valid argument for the interpretation of those words.

Second, in the creed it is prohibited not only that one should not put forward anything other than what is contained in the Nicene Creed, but that one should not even *hold* it.

If I were to ask you whether you hold that God is eternal, I am certain you would say yes. But according to this view, someone could say that you are anathematized, because this word is not in the Nicene Creed. And you hold many other things that are not in the Nicene Creed — as you know — and so on for infinitely many truths which you know are not in the Nicene Creed.

Cyril's Letter and the Seventh Synod on the Intent of the Fathers

This is clear from the letter of Cyril, who, having recited the Nicene Creed, adds: "*We, following the definitions of the holy fathers, pursue their intention and expound the right faith.*"

It likewise appears from the Seventh Synod, where it is said: "*Pursuing with all diligence the intention of the truth*" — and those fathers say: "*we, pursuing the intention of the truth, take away nothing*" from what was said by the fathers of Nicaea and the fathers of the other councils; and yet they made other definitions than those others had made — they made definitions concerning images. From this the intention of the fathers is evident: that the truth be made manifest and not be passed over in silence.

The Case of Pope Leo at the Council of Chalcedon

In the last place I reserved one matter which appears to be the case now running before us. And before I come to it, I will say one thing that pertains to illuminating this matter.

The Council of Chalcedon says that there were some who were speaking ill of Pope Leo and saying that he had made *"a foreign exposition of the faith"* and that he had gone further than was permitted according to the Nicene fathers. Hence it says: *"Let no one accuse Pope Leo of having brought a foreign exposition — as if it were not permitted to anyone to expound the faith beyond the fathers who convened at Nicaea."* The Council immediately speaks against those *"who resist the truth."* The synod excuses Leo and says that Leo did not act against the prohibition of the law by expounding and declaring the faith, because *"when errors arise, various remedies must be applied. And although the faith expounded by the holy fathers would suffice, because there are those who endeavor to pervert the right meaning of the saints, it is necessary to meet them and to declare and expound the faith. For if all were content with the faith as established, and none wished to introduce any other innovation, there would be no need to think of anything beyond what has been declared in the faith. But because many stray from the right path through obstacles, going along the way of falsehood and deceit, it is necessary for us to open the way of truth"* — and it says many things to the effect that declaration is necessary.

The Case of Eutyches at the Second Council of Ephesus

Now I come to what I last wished to say. You, dearest fathers, know that Flavian had condemned Eutyches in the Council of Constantinople; afterwards the Second Council of Ephesus was held — which was subsequently rejected — and there Dioscorus ruled tyrannically. In that synod, Eutyches wished to excuse himself by saying he was not in error, and he recited his faith — namely the Nicene Creed — word for word. And afterwards he said that *"this faith of the fathers is what I wish to live and die in,"* and that the Nicene faith had been confirmed by the first Council of

Ephesus, which had prohibited the putting forward of another faith and had prohibited the adding of anything. Hence he said: *"I hold the right faith"* — and Flavian did not, because Flavian said that Christ is in two natures; this, he said, Flavian had added to the Nicene Creed, for it is not said in it that Christ is in two natures. And Eutyches understood the prohibition as referring to verbal addition.

A certain Eusebius, bishop of Dorylaeum, hearing this, cried out: *"He has lied — there is no such definition, no rule commanding this."* Dioscorus said: *"How is there no such rule? We have here five codices"* in which it is said that it is not permitted to add anything.

Response to the Claim That Private Persons May Hold Different Beliefs

As to what you say — that it is permitted to private persons to believe something other than what is in the Creed, if it be true, but that it is not publicly permitted to profess another creed — I say that this is expressly against the words of the definition, for it says: *"Let no one be permitted,"* etc., and adds: if he is a bishop, let him be deprived of his bishopric; if a cleric, etc.; if a layman, let him be excommunicated. From this it follows that whoever speaks — whether publicly or privately — incurs the penalty. And from the fact that it named laypeople, the intention is clear: that whatever layman held this would be excommunicated, since laypeople are not accustomed to chant the Creed in church — only clerics are.

Hence the intention was to prohibit everyone, both in church and outside. From this it appears that, since they are privately prohibited from holding another faith, all would be excommunicated if they wished to understand another faith, etc.

The Letter of Agatho and the Sixth Council

Furthermore, to make this clearer: the profession of faith made by Agathon, sent to the Sixth Council, was not Agathon's alone but that of the entire

Western Church — for that letter says "*together with all the Western synods*" subject to him, and **CLX** bishops subscribed to that letter.

The Word "Necessity" Not Expressed in the Prohibition

Likewise, yesterday the Lord of Nicaea, in responding to the Lord Archbishop of Kolossi, said that the word "*necessity*" is not expressed. And I give you the same answer: this is not contained in the prohibition — whether in general or in particular — and therefore it must be understood generally, whether in public or in private.

The Silence on the Constantinopolitan Creed at Ephesus

I also wish to say another thing. At the Council of Ephesus, no mention was ever made of the Constantinopolitan Creed. Either the fathers forgot it and wished only the Nicene Creed to be sung — in which case the following fathers could not have sung the Constantinopolitan Creed, and we would be doing wrong to recite the Constantinopolitan Creed; or they remembered it, and then to recite it would be contrary and not permitted; or they considered them the same — and then one must see that it differs from the Nicene Creed in many words, and because it contains the same faith, it is considered one and the same.

And those fathers said yesterday that the Constantinopolitan Creed is virtually contained in the Nicene Creed and that when one is read, the other is seen as read. Therefore, wherever one creed does not disagree in the truth of the faith, it is to be regarded as one and the same. Therefore it is not prohibited by this law, because the law prohibits *another faith* — and thus one must necessarily understand this as referring to a faith contrary to the truth.

The Sixth Synod's Interpretation of the Prohibition

I say one further thing in elucidation of this matter: what is defined in councils appears to be defined through the Holy Spirit. And the Spirit who is

in one is in another. But in the Sixth Synod, where this prohibitive law was repeated, they say thus: "*Let no one be permitted to put forward another faith nor to hold another view, in overturning of those things that have been defined.*" Hence the Holy Spirit, who was present in the fathers of the Sixth Synod, interprets these words — "*another faith*" — as meaning "*in overturning*"; it is not permitted, but not in the sense of declaration or greater expression of the truth.

Recourse to the Legislator's Intent

Likewise, when there is doubt about the words of a law, recourse must be had to the intention of the legislator, and this intention is grasped from the preamble of the law or from its proceedings. But in the preamble of that session of Ephesus, the fathers declared that they had convened and wished the Nicene Creed to be read, and that the speeches and the Creed be compared, and that the speeches consonant with it be confirmed and those discrepant be rejected. Hence the intention of the legislator was to remove the addition that would take away the faith or the truth — it was not the intention of the most holy fathers that we look only at the words, but at the true understanding of Holy Scripture.

The Synod of Chalcedon Vindicates Flavian

These things were recited at Chalcedon; the synod said nothing against the bishop of Dorylaeum — indeed it appears to approve him, as I shall show. In this synod then, Dioscorus passed sentence against Flavian, and in the words of the sentence declared that he was deposing him because they had acted against the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus, where it is said that it is not permitted to add anything — for at the Council of Ephesus it is said that if anyone adds to the Nicene Creed, if he is a bishop, let him be deprived. And therefore he deprived Flavian and Eusebius of their episcopates as transgressors of the law. And all the bishops who had been present at the condemned Second Council of Ephesus followed the sentence of Dioscorus, and all those bishops founded themselves on this prohibition of the Council of Ephesus. Hence they said: "*Flavian and*

Eusebius showed themselves strangers to the priestly order, who endeavored to add or diminish anything from the holy faith which was expounded at Nicaea by the holy council; the holy synod convened in this city of Ephesus confirmed that it is always just that those who dare to add anything to or diminish anything from the faith should be strangers to the priesthood of the Church" — and the other following bishops spoke likewise.

When these things were related at the Council of Chalcedon, all said: *"Anathema to Dioscorus; let Dioscorus be condemned at this hour for having judged wrongly"* — and thus they revoked what had been done against Flavian, and judged that Flavian had not acted against the Nicene or Ephesian Council, because although the profession that Christ is in two natures is not contained in the Nicene Creed in expressed words, it is nonetheless not against the truth, but is virtually drawn from the Nicene Creed.

From this it appears manifestly that one who adds by way of declaration is not to be censured, provided he speaks the truth consonant with the catholic faith. And it seems to me that no better example could be adduced in the world than the example of Flavian.

Conclusion of the Cardinal's Argument

I conclude that those words of the prohibition — that it is not permitted to put forward another faith, nor to add or diminish — are to be understood of those who hold a faith contrary to the truth, and who alter the true understanding of Holy Scripture and of the Nicene Creed. This, according to my plain judgment, seems to me to resolve this question manifestly. If it is not so, I desire to be informed.

Hence, since the Latin Church says it has added nothing against the truth nor against the true sense of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creed, this question — of whether it was permitted — should be set aside, and one must proceed to the question of whether it is true that the Spirit proceeds from the Son. And if they can prove that he does not proceed, then I will

say expressly that the Roman Church was not permitted, for then it would have held a faith contrary to the truth. But if they cannot prove this to be false, and it shall instead be shown from Holy Scripture and the holy doctors that it is true, then it will be necessary to confess that both were permitted.

These are the things I wished to say, subject to the correction of our most holy lord and of the emperor and of the others.

Response of the Lord of Nicaea

NICENUS. My reverend lord, truly all the arguments and speeches said by both sides were most excellently and wisely spoken — especially the last arguments by your paternity, which bear most directly on the matter. You touched on what pertained to the question proposed by us and omitted nothing. Nevertheless, we will respond with charity, and again with equal charity we will hear what you wish to say. We think, however, that many of the things said by you support our side — yet we do not judge this to be the time, for two reasons: first, because of the lateness of the hour, for it is time to rise; and second, because even as the words were good, they were no less numerous. And so we wish to have these things in writing, to reflect upon them, and to give the due response in due time. Now, in the name of the Lord, let us rise, and we will receive the speeches in writing — and especially what was said last.

Intervention of the Archbishop of Kolossi

ANDREAS. The Archbishop of Kolossi rose and, speaking against the Greeks, set forth the following to the Supreme Pontiff in the sacred assembly.

ARCHBISHOP OF KOLOSSI. Most holy father, since yesterday we agreed that from the things which are said the Scriptures would be compared — and since yesterday these Greeks were unwilling to come — they appear to be transgressors of their promises, and therefore we protest, so that nothing may be done in transgression of the faith.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Yesterday there was rain, and because we said that the things spoken were not to the point, we did not wish to examine what you had said; nevertheless, so that charity might be preserved, we were content that they be given to the notaries.

ARCHBISHOP OF KOLOSSI. I request an instrument recording that they said they were unwilling to receive them and that they were not to the point — for to say that what I have spoken was not to the point is an injury not to me, but to the entire Roman Church, that these Greeks should dare presume to pass judgment on whether or not what was said was to the point.

ANDREAS. When these things had been set forth, an end was given to the disputation of that day.

ACTUS DECIMUS — 18 November

Opening Remarks of the Bishop of Forlì (Continued from Previous Session)

...the clear truth, which you did not previously ignore — I think you did this to test how we Latins know how to respond. I ask that we come to the greater difficulty. And as I said yesterday: if you prove that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, I declare plainly that the Roman Church was not permitted; but if you cannot prove it and show the contrary, then I am certain you will not make a difficulty of whether that declaration could have been placed there. Nevertheless, let nothing remain on my account — I am prepared to respond to all objections. But perhaps it would be better that in those three ordinary days of disputation the discussion of the principal matter be held, and in the others we continue with this. Question me and I am prepared, Lord Bishop of Ephesus. I will say one word, and I will speak as with a father, for I can be instructed by you. You had to say that this prohibition did not exist before the Third Council of Ephesus. I can show the contrary, and it is good — so that, even if I said it in writing, I did not say it here — the stronger argument to be assigned, that no syllable

can be placed in the Creed, is from the letter of Cyril. Yet, if your paternity attends carefully, that letter says: *"let nothing be passed over"* — that is, changed — it does not say *"added."* But granted that it had said so, it does not count against us.

Cyril founds himself on the authority of Holy Scripture, which says: *"Remember him who said: 'Do not move the ancient boundaries which your fathers have set.' It was not they who spoke, but the Spirit of God."* Hence Cyril founds himself on this authority, which prohibits adding or subtracting, and says: the holy fathers and the Holy Spirit through them did these things. It is certain that those holy fathers existed before the council, since it was a saying of Solomon — who lived long before the Third Council, and the Nicene Council, indeed even before the faith of Christ expressed in the New Testament. Likewise Celestine says: *"Who is not worthy of anathema, who adds to the apostolic faith, which receives neither increase nor diminution, and which binds with great penalty both those who add and those who subtract?"* And he says: *"We read in our books that nothing is to be added or diminished."*

This letter was written before the beginning of the Council of Ephesus. And yet Celestine professes that it had been previously prohibited to add to the faith of the apostles. I have two witnesses; I wish to have a third — *"for in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall stand."* And I cite the Seventh Synod, which says: *"For those things which have been handed down in the catholic Church admit neither increase nor diminution; and the penalty of the curse especially binds those who add and those who diminish, as Scripture asserts against him who moves the boundaries of his fathers, nor have they had the purpose of knowing the truth."* Therefore the Seventh Synod founds itself on this authority of Holy Scripture, and says that this applies to those who had no purpose of knowing the truth.

Hence it is clear that he is said to add or subtract who transgresses the boundaries of the fathers by altering the truth; but he who declares the truth does not transgress the boundaries of the fathers. And the reason is that, as Cyril says, this prohibition was made through the Holy Spirit speaking through the holy fathers — since the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth. He

who speaks the truth is within the Spirit and neither adds nor subtracts; but he who speaks falsehood is the one who exits the boundaries of the Holy Spirit, and he is the one who must be judged as transgressing or adding to the boundaries of the fathers. And this text declares that he is the one who adds or diminishes who has no purpose of knowing the truth.

Since, therefore, this prohibition made by the holy fathers preceded the Nicene Council, shall we say that the Nicene Council transgressed the boundaries of its fathers? Otherwise, if we were to understand transgression in terms of words, the Nicene Council would have transgressed the boundaries of the fathers, because it subtracted certain things from the...

Session of 18 November — Tenth Session

The fathers assembled together in the customary place and hours, and the Bishop of Ephesus, first among the Greeks, spoke thus.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We, beloved fathers, are present here not to contradict one another or to overturn what is said on either side — for this pertains more to ostentation than to the way of truth — but so that we may together examine, inquire, make peace, and scrutinize with diligence the questions and difficulties that arise in our disputations, and so that in this way we may jointly compare matters and, inquiring, advance until we come to the end, which is the inquiry into truth.

For this reason, the things which the reverend Lord Archbishop of Kolossi said on several occasions, and what the reverend bishop and master says — these too we will pursue individually with God's help and as the hour permits, and we will take care to respond to each of the things said by these fathers with appropriate opportunity, without regard for any display of speech. And we will say what appears true from the concessions of your reverend paternities.

But at this beginning, if it so please, we will proceed to respond to the things said by the reverend lord Cardinal sitting there, examining each of

those points individually and separately. For the things said by the same reverend lord Cardinal bear more directly on the matter and touch on the difficulty itself, and his reverend paternity set them forth in order. Therefore we will return this courtesy with such an ordered response that we ought to leave none of the things said unaddressed. I say, however, that I will respond to the things said extemporaneously by his reverend paternity, not to those that were polished and set forth in a more refined form.

I therefore beseech your reverend paternity that whenever it should happen that your lordship wishes to ask a question, it may please your lordship either to concede or to deny what I say. For I intend to inquire into and scrutinize the speeches and arguments with your paternity, since I recognize that your reverend paternity rejoices more in the pursuit of truth than in the defense of your own words. Hence, even if it should happen that one of your arguments is refuted by me, your reverend paternity, as a most wise man, will rather esteem me. For a wise man, when argued against, loves the one who argues against him according to reason. Let it be permitted to your lordship to ask questions as will please you at an appropriate time and place; for I will most willingly bear it, and I myself, when your lordship corrects my words and asks something and seeks a reason, will respond with God's help. Let your lordship refute, as shall seem good, whatever has been poorly said by me.

Let your lordship know that whatever has been said by me to which your lordship does not object or make inquiry — these will remain approved, and they cannot receive any other discussion; and these things are to be observed by those who will receive the speeches after me.

First Argument: The Case of Charisius

The i argument touched upon by your lordship is this: namely, that at the Third Ecumenical Council of Ephesus, a certain Charisius submitted to the council certain libels of faith which he had composed against those holding the doctrine of Nestorius. And although Charisius himself made an exposition of his faith in a form different from the exposition of the Nicene Council, he was in no way reproved by that council. And from this it

appears manifestly that not every other exposition of the faith is simply prohibited, but only a contrary and discordant faith. I ask whether this is indeed the form of your argument.

ANDREAS. The aforementioned Cardinal sought the counsel of his colleagues, and then spoke thus.

CARDINAL. With the grace and good pleasure of our most holy lord and with the patience and correction of these fathers, I have heard gratefully what your paternity said. As far as the preamble is concerned, I will say nothing. As for the question directed at my person: I, following the teaching of Saint Peter, will be prepared to render an account of what I know. But I would have preferred that your paternity had asked one of the other fathers here, since any of them would know better than I. Nevertheless, since you have chosen me, I will do so willingly. But since we are here for the purpose of declaring the truth, I will not be ashamed to be corrected — if I say anything wrongly — both by your paternity and by these fathers, because we ought to love the honor of God, who is truth, more than our own. But with this agreement I respond: that if I respond and my response is not sufficient, it shall not prejudice the truth or others; and I accept your offer that when I ask you a question, an answer shall be given.

Now I come to what was asked, and there was no need for you to ask it, since I gave it in writing and stated it quite openly, and it is expressed there. If you wish me to say more, I will accommodate you; if you wish me to repeat it, I will say it; otherwise it appears in the writings, as I said. Do you wish me to say it?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Reverend lord, I do not seek from you anything other than what is written there, except to say whether the argument is as I have set it forth; therefore it is only necessary that you say either yes or no.

EMPEROR. These fathers do not wish to impose a burden on your reverend paternity; but if it pleases your reverend paternity to respond, let him respond; if not, let another respond.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We have gathered the sense of your words as best we could understand them; if it is so, say yes; otherwise say as you wish. We have briefly made our question and our exposition of your statement — respond briefly.

CARDINAL. I will respond, but henceforth do not question me, but read what I said and then ask further if you wish anything more. This is the sum of the argument: Charisius gave a creed of his faith and it was catholic; and afterwards he recited the transformed Arian creed. The synod repudiated the exposition of the Nestorian creed and not that of Charisius. If it had not been permitted to make that profession, it would have reproved it. And the creed of Charisius is like the Nicene Creed except in two or three words, which are nonetheless true and catholic. Say whatever you please.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. You have agreed with me in all things, reverend lord, that such is the meaning of what was said by your lordship — I said except in one point, namely that the profession of faith of Charisius is true and catholic. For it was catholic only in the understanding of the words, but not in the words themselves; for the arrangement of the words was clearly changed from those set forth by the Nicene fathers, nor did the profession of faith itself show itself consonant with the fathers of Nicaea and holding the same as they. Was the profession of faith set forth by Charisius as a profession of the catholic faith, or as one following the catholic faith and his own exposition? Is it not so?

CARDINAL. I am content that the profession of faith of Charisius follows in all things the true faith in meaning, though not in the words; and when I say "*catholic*," I understand "*true*." But I ask: since he himself admits that that profession is true in meaning and understanding, whether it agrees with the Nicene. Was this profession reproved by the synod or not?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. The council admitted the profession of Charisius as Charisius's — not as the catholic faith, but as consonant with the catholic faith. And we have had enough questions from your reverend paternity on this whole argument. Responding truthfully, we say that

Charisius was not simply accusing the Nestorians of handing on another faith, but for these three reasons.

First: because they were handing on their perverse and deceptive profession of faith to those who were converting to the knowledge of the faith as the universal faith and as handed down by the Nicene fathers — and this therefore relates to a manifest injury to that venerable council which made this exposition of the true faith.

Second: they were accusing those who were sowing those false and perverse dogmas contrary to the true and catholic faith; and for this reason, Charisius rather calls their profession a "*perfidy*" than a faith.

Third: because those Nestorians were pressing and harassing Charisius because he refused to admit their profession of faith, and they considered him a heretic; and therefore Charisius was compelled to set forth the profession of his own faith as he wished and in whatever words, both to show himself consonant with the fathers of Nicaea and to show that he rightly deserved to be expelled by heretics because he did not hold what they held.

This, however, was never prohibited by the Church — that anyone might expound the faith as they wish, for private instruction alone and the demonstration of their own true faith, not for the establishment of a creed. And it was much more permitted at that time, because the definitive prohibition had not yet been issued. It is clearly evident from certain fathers who presided over the Church in those times, and from other councils, that it was permitted to fathers to expound a profession of faith as they wished and in whatever words they wished. For blessed Agathon — as your lordship said — wrote the exposition and profession of his faith together with those who were with him, and sent it as he wished, as he had written it, to the Sixth Council, etc. And following this Agathon, blessed Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, restored to his church, wrote a profession of faith as he wished and sent it to the Patriarch of Constantinople, which profession was recited at the council. And therefore all bishops — indeed archbishops and patriarchs — wrote to one another

and professed their exposition of the faith; which letters of theirs contained nothing other than the profession of their own true faith and opinion. This is observed up to the present day among the Eastern patriarchs: for the other patriarchs, who are subordinate to the Patriarch of Constantinople in the ordering of dignity, immediately set forth an exposition of faith and send it to the Patriarch of Constantinople — and this was anciently the custom and is now observed. Therefore it is not surprising if Charisius too, through his profession of faith, expounds the catholic faith — not with the intention that all should use his as they use the Nicene Creed, but only for the demonstration of his own faith and his own, as has been said.

If however you have something to say regarding the profession of faith of Charisius, say it, and we shall hear most willingly. We ask whether the profession of faith of Charisius was handed to the council to demonstrate his own faith or so that all might use it as the Nicene Creed. For private expositions, as we said, were never prohibited. If you have something to say, say it.

Cardinal's Response on the Three Causes

CARDINAL. You have set forth a threefold cause for which Charisius stated his faith and for which the synod repudiated the creed of the Nestorians.

First: because those Nestorians believed their creed to be the same as the Nicene Creed.

Second: because that creed contained falsehood.

Third: because they were reproaching Charisius as a heretic and as one who held wrongly.

As to the **i**: those Nestorians handed on their profession in the manner of a creed, and my text does not say they handed it on as the Nicene Creed.

As to the **ii**: I say that it appears from the text that they were spurning the Nicene faith and had added a creed of another faith — indeed of perfidy.

These are formally the words of the synod: "*For when he had come to Philadelphia,*" etc. — the words of Charisius. Hence I say that this was not the reason why the synod was moved to repudiate the creed of the Nestorians. But the cause, as the definition says, is that it contained what was perverse. The reason: because if that Nestorian creed had contained the truth, the synod would have admitted it as it admitted the creed of Charisius, and would not have repudiated it.

As to the **ii** cause: I say it is true, because it was repudiated on account of the fact that it contained falsehood.

As to the **iii**: I say it is not sufficient, and the synod was not moved by it — and the reason is that the synod had no concern for whether Charisius was reproached or not, but only for whether it was true or not. Hence, setting aside the **i** and **iii** causes, I say that the **ii** was the final cause of the synod in making that definition.

Then your paternity said that the synod did not prohibit a private person from making an exposition for himself, as he wished, provided it be true; afterwards you cite the example of Agathon and Sophronius, who made their expositions of faith and were not reprov'd at the Sixth Synod. But here the question arises of whether Charisius, Agathon, and Sophronius acted against the constitution or not — and then I will respond to yours.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. In no way did Agathon and Sophronius transgress that prohibition; because they did not add to or subtract from the common creed, but acted privately; hence they are not encompassed by the penalties and prohibitions. It has been said that this is not prohibited — but that a profession be given in place of the creed, this is expressly prohibited.

CARDINAL. I am content that neither Agathon nor Sophronius acted against the prohibition, and I respond to your question. I say that Charisius gave his profession as true and consonant with the right faith and the Nicene Creed — but he did not hand it on as one giving a law of the Church for the whole Church to use, because it was not within his power to command the people. Hence it suffices for me that he did not act against

the prohibition. Afterwards, if the universal Church or one who holds the place of the Church wishes to teach the people, it suffices for me that he does not act against the prohibition. Now say whatever you please.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. This is what we have gathered from the response of your lordship: namely, that Charisius was rightly not reproved by the council, because he had not acted against the prohibition. Therefore it does not follow that from this the fathers of the council appear to grant a license to transform the Nicene Creed. And thus your argument is repelled. But whether some church has the authority and license to give a common creed differing in words or syllables — this we will speak of at another time. And therefore I ask your lordship: could it have been permitted to that Charisius to hand on the exposition of his faith to those who were following the faith of the Nestorians, according to the profession which he afterwards made in the creed? For your lordship touched somewhat on this, and therefore let him clarify: was it permitted to those Nestorians — setting aside the Nicene Creed — to compose another creed in its place and hand it on to those they were baptizing, if it had contained the truth? Now your lordship has said that such a license belongs to the universal Church. I ask whether the Nestorians would have had it, if they had had a true creed.

Further Exchange on the Nestorian Creed

CARDINAL. You have made two questions, but you have not said one thing that must not be passed over. You said that the prohibition does not mean that no one has the license to make his own creed. To this I say that it suffices for the elucidation of our question that the synod does not prohibit anyone from handing on an exposition of his faith or a creed according to the truth.

NICENUS. I add that the universal Church does not prohibit anyone from giving an exposition, provided it be a true exposition.

CARDINAL. This definition, according to you, does not prohibit anyone from setting forth and professing a creed as they wish, provided it be true. I wish to show — and I take the word "*other*" to mean different in words,

even if true, as you wish to interpret it — that you contradict the text. The text says: *"Let no one be permitted to put forward another faith."* You understand *"another faith"* as meaning in different words, even if consonant with the right faith. If this is so, let your paternity note that you contradict the text, which says: *"neither clerics, nor bishops, nor laypeople"* — and at the end it is read in the singular, about a bishop, a cleric, or a layman. Hence if those words *"another faith"* have the meaning you say, the contrary of what you said follows — because you concede that a private person can make a creed for himself, and yet the text is to the contrary when understanding the prohibition as *"another faith in other words."* And let this suffice for the understanding you give, which is against your own statements.

As for the understanding of these words: I have said enough in writing, and I say that the text does not say that no one is permitted to put forward another faith universally, but says one contrary to the Nicene faith. And the text does not say it is not permitted in public or in private, but says *"another faith."* And that the word *"another faith"* must be understood as contrary — this appears from what was done at the beginning of that session; for when the bishops had assembled, it was said: *"Let the creed be read, let the speeches of Cyril and Nestorius be compared, and let those found consonant with the Nicene faith be confirmed, and those discordant be rejected."* Now a synod that makes definitions does so according to the understanding of the beginning — and thus those words *"another faith"* are to be understood. I could cite other arguments for what I have given in writing; and so as not to disrupt the manner of argumentation, let this suffice.

Now I respond to the two questions. And before I respond, I say: you stated that before the Third Synod no prohibition had been made; and to this I say that I am prepared to show from the acts of the Third and Sixth Councils that this prohibition had been made before. And if it shall please you to hear, I will say it now; nonetheless, not to evade the question, I respond to the i: you ask whether it was permitted to Charisius — though he could make a creed for himself — to make a creed into which all those converting would be received.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We ask whether the Nestorians had the power of the universal Church.

CARDINAL. That was the ii.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. To the i I was given an answer, and you said no; and therefore I asked whether it would have been permitted to the Nestorians if they had had the truth. For by this reasoning you removed my argument with these words — namely, when I said that it was not permitted to the Nestorians to make a creed in which others were to be baptized — your lordship said that the creed of Nestorius was repudiated because it contains falsehood, and you added that if it had contained the truth, it would have been approved.

CARDINAL. And now I say that if it had contained the truth, it would have passed as the creeds of Agathon and Sophronius passed. And I ground myself in the text, which says that the cause of reprobation is that it contains the perverse dogmas of Nestorius. Then I say that the Nestorians, if they had set forth a true exposition of the faith, would not have been reprov'd; but they could not have commanded the universal Church to profess it universally, because they did not have the power of the universal Church.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. That Nestorian creed was unlike the creed of Agathon and Charisius and the others — even if it had been true — because that Nestorian creed was handed on to those converting in place of the Nicene Creed. But the other creed of Charisius was not handed on as a common discipline and as a common creed in which they were to be baptized. Therefore the Nestorian creed would not be similar — even if it had been true compared with the others — and it would rightly have been repudiated even if it had been true. The others were not repudiated because they were not handed on as a common creed. And since your lordship appears to have given a license to the Nestorians, this would not be permitted. For Charisius and the others did not touch the creed.

CARDINAL. On the contrary — Charisius did touch the Nicene Creed, because he added "*the Holy Spirit consubstantial*" and other words not in the Nicene Creed. And as to what you said — so that I pass nothing over, since you entangle many arguments — I would wish you to make them individually, so that I could respond to each one. I say that there is no difference between the creed of the Nestorians, the creed of Charisius, and that of Tarasius, if that creed had contained the truth. And your paternity must not take a different meaning from the text of the law than the law declares. The law says that it is repudiated because it contained a false dogma; therefore in this you must ground yourselves and not in another. To hand on a creed by private persons for all to use — this is not prohibited by this law; by this law alone only the profession of false faith is prohibited. But whether a private person can give this — I say no, not by this law, but by another law, by which it is provided that no one can command except those over whom he has power. I also wish to give another reason: because what publicly concerns all, all inferiors must follow the rite of the superior churches.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Again your lordship returns to what you were saying first — that it is permitted to the universal Church to hand on a creed to those under it. As to the argument I made, you have not clearly responded to me: namely, whether if those Nestorians had had the power to make a creed — if it had been true —

CARDINAL. What do you wish to infer from this? I respond from the text, and thus clearly.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Does your lordship concede that it would have been permitted to the Nestorians to give their creed to those being baptized by them, and to baptize according to it, if it were true — namely as the exposition of Charisius?

CARDINAL. To hand on as common what is private would be to say what is false. The Nestorians, if they had made a true creed, could have held it, put it forward, and taught it; but if they had said it was the Nicene Creed in meaning and word, they would not have said what is true. But to put

forward a creed of truth — this they could well have done. But to say that what is private is common would be false.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. It is clear that those Nestorians used their creed as a common one, since they were baptizing in it. Would they have had the power to do so if it had been true?

CARDINAL. I say they could have put it forward, but they could not have handed it on as common.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. I said it well: the Nestorians were accused because they were handing on a transformed common creed and baptizing under it. But if those Nestorians had had the license to do this — as your lordship seems to say, that the law of prohibition had not yet been issued — then this cause which moved the council to issue that prohibition would not have provided what was the intention of the fathers. Since because of this license of transforming the creed — because it was prohibited — they could not have placed perverse dogmas; therefore the council, providing that such things could not happen in future, necessarily made a prohibitive definition, which defines and determines generally that *"no one is permitted to hand on, put forward, or compose another faith beyond that of the Nicene Council."* This the council itself decreed and recognized to have been the cause, lest false things be inserted into the truth; and thus it appears that the fathers of the Third Council were moved by this license — which the Nestorians were using in transforming the creed — to make the prohibition. This we gather as something derived from your own words.

CARDINAL. Whom do you wish to have more credit — the definition of the Council of Ephesus or yourselves?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We believe both the definition itself and those who expounded and interpreted it. And if there is any difficulty, one must believe the interpreters who were principal parties there when the definition was promulgated — which blessed Cyril expounds for us, both in the letter he had written to John of Antioch and to Acacius of Melitene. Let us look at the interpretation of that letter and follow it; for there would be no one who

could better expound the definition. Now, if your lordship wishes to say something, let him say it.

CARDINAL. The synod assigns this as the cause of the prohibition of the Nestorian creed: that it held falsehood.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. The synod does not adduce this as the only cause.

CARDINAL. The definition says that it commands those to be subject to excommunication who hold the creed. Therefore it appears that the perverse dogma of Nestorius was the creed itself. Then it appears through the words of Charisius, who says that they spurned the Nicene faith and issued another creed — that is, a perverse one. **Third:** because what is contained in the Nestorian creed had been read from the letter of Nestorius, since the same perfidy was contained in the letter as in the creed of the same. Cyril asked the synod whether what was contained in the letter was true. The synod said it was false. Hence for that reason the synod passed sentence.

As to what you say, that Cyril must be believed — I agree that he must be believed. And the letter of Cyril written to John does not stand against this; on the contrary, it proves this meaning. And if you carefully consider the words of the letter, he understands those words "*another faith*" — namely not with regard to words, but with regard to meaning — because it is certain that in the letter of Cyril and in the response of John there are many things in the exposition of the faith that are not in the Nicene Creed. And nonetheless he says: "*adding nothing or diminishing*" — and yet in words he adds much, though not in meaning. Hence through that letter it appears that it is not called "*another faith*" which differs in words, if it does not differ in meaning.

Likewise, the letter to Acacius does not stand against this — it is rather for us, because to those words "*another faith*" it adds: he who declares otherwise than the faith is — this one is contrary to me. These are the words: "*He who once, in some way*" etc. And it follows: "*But he who wishes*

to do this — that is, to declare — innovates nothing, nor is he known to innovate the exposition of the faith, but rather makes it more manifest." What could you have that is clearer?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. How does the letter begin?

CARDINAL. Yesterday I had said I did not have it, and it was because it had not been indexed; afterwards, searching, I found it in certain instructions called the secret writings of Nestorius. And it begins: "*The matter is indeed sweet and worthy.*" And after those words, "*another exposition*" — it declares itself as meaning another, that is, contrary.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We do not have it.

Cyril's Testimony on the Prohibition

CARDINAL. It declares that Cyril appears to add nothing and to innovate nothing — he who, asking whether he had put forward a faith consonant with the Nicene Creed, received from all the answer that Cyril had spoken consonantly with the Nicene Creed; and although he spoke more openly and clearly than the Nicene Creed, he appears to have introduced nothing new, but rather to hold the same as the Nicene Council. Hence if those words "*another faith*" were to signify one different in words, certainly Cyril would have fallen under the prohibition.

Then I wish to cite the words of Cyril in his exposition of the creed, and from this you will see what the meaning of the prohibition is and what the synod wished to prohibit. The letter begins: "*Love of doctrine and love of labor*" — where these words are found: "*Now the holy synod which assembled in Ephesus delivered its holy sentence against the evil opinion and vanity of Nestorius and of others who were with him or had preceded him, holding equal views and daring to teach or write together with him; and it condemned them and imposed on them the same charge — that is, the penalty.*" Hence from this letter it appears that the synod condemned the evil dogmas of Nestorius, and thus it appears that the word "*another faith*" is to be understood as meaning a contrary one — namely the Nestorian

one or one similar to it. It likewise appears that the Nestorian creed was repudiated because it held views similar to Nestorius. And indeed Cyril himself, the composer of the definition, says that he condemns Nestorius and those who hold views equal to his. Hence it is clear that the Nestorian creed was disapproved, and that he who held dogma equal to Nestorius — which is against what your paternity was saying before, assigning another cause. Hence since your paternity recognizes this matter to be most easy and to have no difficulty — since all would understand it from the words — and since you are a most learned man, I beseech your paternity not to wish to hold so great an audience to a matter which children could resolve. But so as not to waste time, let us enter the principal matter and leave aside these things which have no difficulty. Nevertheless I am prepared to respond — today and always. But this question is not useful and has no outcome of truth.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We do not think the speeches of which we treat and speak are such as to be most easily repelled by children, as your lordship said; but we think them necessary and otherwise useful, since we are speaking of voices and authorities of the holy fathers — first presupposing this: that even if your dogma were true and correct, it still ought not to be added to the creed nor sung together with the creed. It is better for us to labor over such things and to let the theological arguments stand immovable and unshaken. For this adheres more closely to the difficulties of the matters to be discussed. We make known to your reverend paternity this: our intention is in no way to desist from the discussion of this difficulty unless we first arrive at some true conclusion. We say and hold and can easily show that if the dogma in question is found to be true, it could be placed under a private definition, as has been done in many ecumenical councils. But from the creed itself nothing should be removed, subtracted, or added, so that the unity of Christians can be preserved from scandals.

The Cardinal on Time and the Principal Question

CARDINAL. Since time is the most precious thing men can have, I would therefore wish that what the Emperor said be done — that time not be spent in vain. There has been sufficient disputation on this question both through writings and spoken words on both sides. I think that your lordship recognizes the truth and that learned and wise men judge in their minds that this question has no difficulty. But I do not reprove you who introduced it, for you act as wise men who, wishing to enter on great matters, begin with lighter ones. So you, about to enter on the matter of the Holy Spirit, wished to set this one before it as easier. But since this has now been discussed for so long and well...

On the Constantinopolitan Creed and Ancient Manuscripts

...of the Apostles' Council. And likewise regarding the Council of Constantinople, which council, after this prohibition, added many things to the Nicene Creed. And because it spoke the truth, it is not considered to have added. And therefore what has been said repeatedly — that the fathers after the Third Council could not add, and that it had been permitted before — is not true.

Then I say that we have a Greek book where the Constantinopolitan Creed is found, in which the words *"from heaven"* are absent — it says, however, *"descended"* — and also this, namely *"according to the Scriptures,"* is absent. We have here two volumes of the Council of Chalcedon, and they are very ancient — one is over five hundred years old, as it appears. And in it the Constantinopolitan Creed is placed three times, and the words *"from heaven"* and *"according to the Scriptures"* are never placed therein.

Likewise I have another in Lombard script, most ancient, as are the canons of all the councils; and it has the Constantinopolitan Creed without those words *"from heaven"* and *"according to the Scriptures."* And thus from these three books it appears that the Constantinopolitan Creed did not have those words *"from heaven"* and *"according to the Scriptures."* The book which you showed from the Fourth Council — it is perhaps not ten years since it was written, as appears; ours are most ancient, five hundred years old.

Likewise there is a similar book in Greek, ancient, brought from Constantinople. Likewise we place in our creed certain words beyond the Constantinopolitan Creed, and we are not argued against for this; we place "*God from God*" — that is not in the Constantinopolitan Creed — and yet no one has ever reproached us for those words as they do for the *filioque*.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. That — "*God from God*" — was in the Nicene Creed, and in other things we agree; therefore let us not inquire about these.

CARDINAL. It was not in the Constantinopolitan Creed, and I say that since we agree that the words "*from heaven*" are sung beyond the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, it follows that there is no difference between our fathers and you regarding syllables, but regarding truth.

Closing Exchanges and Proposed Next Session

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. As to the things said first — since they have been lengthy — there is no time to respond, even though your lordship asked us to respond and wished to be informed; this is above our dignity. Nevertheless we would have responses to them and would arrive at the meaning of the truth. Similarly as to the last words made about these books which your lordship produced — we do not have time to respond now, for time does not permit it; they will be referred to an opportune time, at which time they will be suitably inquired into.

But since among your speeches your lordship made mention in the preceding assemblies of the fact that it is permitted to the universal Church and first to him who presides over the universal Church to alter creeds — since it is manifestly clear that your lordship looks to the Roman Church and has had regard to the one presiding at Rome — we do not permit this to be passed over without discussion. We wish to make a speech on this argument in the next assembly, if it please. For we have many and distinguished things to say on this with more effective arguments. But we suspect that perhaps the words to be said on this may cause scandal. Therefore I said I wish to speak thus, if it please. Let the choice rest with

your lordship. And if it seems good to you, let it be done; for we are prepared for this.

CARDINAL. Among the other articles of your differences from us is the question of the power of the Roman Pontiff. And since we are in the discussion of this article on the Holy Spirit, it does not seem fitting to mix in the question of the power of the Supreme Pontiff. And therefore in writing I said: *"Concerning the authority of the Roman Church I do not now speak, but reserve it for another time."* And when we are in the discussion of that topic, you will freely be able to say what shall be permitted. And you must believe that you will not offend our most holy lord the Pope, because he is here only so that the truth may be declared. And by the grace of God, this truth of the Apostolic See and the Roman Church is so manifest through the holy universal councils that if this question in which we are engaged has some small difficulty, that one will have much less. But certainly, as I said, since it is a distinct article, it would not be good to mix it with the article on the Holy Spirit. Therefore, again and again, it would seem — and I beseech you — that you may wish to begin the matter of the procession of the Holy Spirit, for it will be more useful than this in which we are now engaged. And truly, if we were in agreement on that article, I believe that no difficulty would remain in the others. And I hope that in the other articles we shall be in good agreement.

Final Address to the Pope

ANDREAS. Having said these things, he wished to address a word to the Pope, who with the greatest attention of all, by now at the **xxiii** hour, with the cold most severe, had listened most patiently to everything.

CARDINAL. Most blessed father, it would seem that your holiness together with the lord Emperor might ordain that one proceed to the principal business. Nevertheless I say to you, reverend Greek fathers: we are prepared to respond to all your questions.

ANDREAS. When these things had been set forth and silence had fallen, the Supreme Pontiff rose, and by his rising gave all permission to rise.

ACTUS DECIMUS — Second, Third, and Fourth Days of Collation

Preamble: On Leaving the Sheep to Seek the Lost

...to be left behind in the desert in order to go after the one that was lost, and to bring it back on his own shoulders to the fold in a salutary way — he both taught this and did it. Indeed, when reproved by the Jews because he ate with publicans and sinners, he is constantly read to have answered steadfastly that he was sent only to *"the sheep that were lost of the house of Israel,"* and that *"it is not the healthy who need a physician, but the sick."*

By this, if I am not mistaken, he was vividly intimating to future pastors of the Church how great a necessity rests upon them — in the manner of speaking of the Apostle — *"in season and out of season,"* through *"glory and dishonor, through ill repute and good repute,"* continuously to provide and attend, so that over those whom the Holy Spirit *"has placed to rule the Church of God"* no stain of schism whatsoever arises or remains, and that most mournful and detestable cry does not resound: *"I am of Cephas, I am of Apollo."* For a small spark, if allowed to burn for too long, frequently sets a great forest ablaze — just as blessed Gregory says: *"a sin which is not soon washed away by penance drags the soul by its own weight toward another."*

For what gave such long duration to the most dreadful schism recently concluded at Constance — from which all the deformity in the world arose — if not the failure arising from the negligence of extinguishing the common fire? How quickly did it emit its flames, what could so easily and happily have been extinguished at its beginning without any loss or disgrace to the parties later condemned! So that therefore the consuming flames of schismatic fire in these unhappy days, rushing on all sides *"like sparks running through stubble,"* may not at last be found to have miserably devoured the sheep and sheepfold of Christ — what more useful, what more fitting, what more distinguished counsel can be given or offered to the true vicar of God, the Supreme Pontiff of those sheep, than that for the

purpose of resisting so imminent and so dangerous a fire — for whose beginnings, a remedy applied too late would perhaps accomplish nothing — for the purpose of preserving the integrity of the seamless garment which even the cruel soldiers killing Christ did not presume to divide, for the purpose of giving to himself and to the Church of God his spouse peace and quiet, and to *"Greeks and barbarians, to the wise and the unwise"* dispersed far and wide throughout the world — to whom, as the Apostle says, he is a *"debtor"* — that he show such great humanity, demonstrate such clemency, and so condescend with paternal affection to their weaknesses, that noble spirits — who are more easily led than dragged — conquered by affability, benevolence, and gentleness rather than by harshness or fear, setting aside all seedbeds and incentives to schism, may glory in hastening swiftly to their brothers and companions, laboring — as must altogether come to pass — that of all the sheep of Christ *"there be one fold and one shepherd?"*

To forgive, as a certain wise man attests, is the highest and most noble form of victory. And the ancient histories of the pagans record that the African Scipio, Julius Caesar, and many other conquerors of the world gained more faithful subjects and friends from the peoples rebelling against them by forgiving, showing mercy, and giving generously than by using swords or chains. For since, as the moral philosopher Seneca says, nothing is more base for a man than to make war against one with whom he has always lived as a friend — and since again, wild and brute animals desire peace and concord as naturally as any other beings, so much so that if it happens they are separated from one another, they do not cease to roam in wandering courses, to bellow, to howl, and to emit various roars and cries, until each one has again been joined together with its like — in what way is it fitting for Christians, adorned with the image of the most blessed Trinity, that the harshness of any division should so harden among them that — contrary to the precept of the Apostle — *"the sun should not set upon their anger,"* and that, leaving aside the gift they offer at the altar, if perhaps one has something against another...

Session of 4 December — Tenth Session

On the fourth of December, at the tenth session, with all standing in attendance, the place of the Greek delegates was empty. Each man looked about to see why this had happened. And because between the preceding disputation and this one the solemn legates of the Duke of Burgundy had arrived and had made solemn orations to the Supreme Pontiff and to the Greeks present at the ecumenical council, and had said nothing publicly to the Greek Emperor — now the Bishop of Chalon, one of the orators who had come from the Duke, rose first and said these words to the Emperor: the most illustrious prince the Duke of Burgundy, inflamed with his whole desire for the union of the Greeks, sends these letters to your serenity with greetings; and since they contain credentials, we are prepared to set them forth in words in the palace of your serenity.

ANDREAS. The Emperor, having received them, sent his interpreter to respond privately to the ambassadors, and then, having returned, the interpreter came back to the ambassadors.

LUDOVICUS. Tell me, I beg, what they set forth.

ANDREAS. Everything that was done through the council we have written down elsewhere; in this treatise we have arranged to set forth nothing other than what concerns the discussion of the faith. But because this exhortation was principally directed toward this union of the faith, I will relate what was gravely set forth by a religious man venerable in age, in years, and in learning — the General Abbot of the Cistercians, who had been the fourth among the orators. For the first in order had been the Bishop of Thérouanne, who, residing at the curia, had been joined by reason of honor and thus said nothing. The second was the Bishop of Chalon, who was the first to speak. But since everything contained in the things set forth by this venerable father is included in his account, those things will appear to have been set forth through his relation. The third was the Bishop of Nevers, who, like the first, maintained silence. The fourth was the aforementioned abbot.

LUDOVICUS. Tell me what the aforementioned father set forth.

ANDREAS. The council was addressed in these words.

THE ORATION FOLLOWS

"If I were weaving a small basket of rushes" — to use the words of blessed Jerome written in his prologue to Job — "or if, plaiting the leaves of palms, in the sweat of my brow I were engaged in the labors of the belly's demand, no mortal would reproach me, nor would I be exposed to be gnawed upon by the bites of detractors, hateful to God."

But now, when I, unlearned in knowledge and in speech, appear to seek things beyond me against the teaching of the wise, and dare in my foolishness to attempt a most arduous work — one for which a more mature eloquence than mine would have been more fitting — namely to declare the ends desirable for every catholic, to wit: the perfect union of the Eastern Church with the Latin, the concord and peace of the fathers, both the most reverend lords the Cardinals and the other lords and ecclesiastics assembled at Basel, with your holiness, most blessed father — ends which the most devoted son of holy mother Church, the Lord Philip by the grace of God Duke of Burgundy, pursues and intends with untiring labors and continual sighs, and who has sent us here present, the orators and nuncios of his ducal highness, to the same holiness and to this present holy council — if, most blessed father and holy synod, the kindness innate to you shall have borne with my imperfection, alas too soon to be revealed, what occasion of succor will there be for me, so that those *"who sit in the gate and those who drink wine"* may not speak in mockery against me?

But because I will not strive to speak from my own resources, but it is my mind to set forth only those things which that most wise prince himself has placed in my mouth, I have therefore conceived great confidence that — if not by my merits, yet in contemplation of and reverence for so great and so catholic a prince — your mercies will patiently bear with my ignorance, and that the Father of mercies, who *"makes even the tongues of infants eloquent,"* will make my words right and well-sounding in your ears.

Fortified by this hope, and specifically relying on this protestation — that all things to be said by me I submit entirely to the correction and determination of your holiness, most blessed father, and of this present holy council — I will endeavor to discharge quickly the second part of the exposition to be made by us orators before this most excellent audience, left to me by the reverend father in Christ the Lord Bishop of Chalon, as it shall be granted to me from on high.

Presuppositions and the Purpose of the Oration

Having presupposed the most well-known truths — which are made clear far more by deed than by word — with which the oration of that reverend father in Christ the Lord Bishop of Chalon, both eloquent and well-spoken, elegantly and abundantly declared the most illustrious prince the Lord Duke of Burgundy to be the most obedient son of your holiness, most blessed father, and to be distinguished in manifold ways in the exalting of his virtues and the amplest titles of his dignities — for some declaration of the means by which that most powerful prince trusts and desires that his most holy desires regarding the procuring and establishing of union and peace in the Church of God may be effectively fulfilled, and for the practical and fervent pursuit of all these things — he sends to the same holiness of yours and to this present holy council these so many and so great reverend, magnificent, noble, and distinguished men, across such great and dangerous stretches of roads: I am not ashamed to set forth in advance the words which the blessed Apostle is read to have directed long ago to the Philippians in the first chapter of his letter to the Philippians, when exhorting them to complete the work they had begun, saying: *"I pray that your charity may abound more and more."*

The understanding of these words is easily grasped from the causes of speaking, if the mind's eye is fixed for a moment on the deduction of the Apostle — who, after having made the Philippians confident of the happy completion of the work begun by them, saying: *"I am confident that he who began a good work in you will bring it to completion until the day of Christ Jesus,"* showing again plainly that he wished to be a cooperator and helper

of such a work, immediately added this: *"I pray that your charity may abound more and more."*

On Charity as the Foundation of All Good Works

For since for the beginning and completion of every good work the virtue of charity — which theologians call the mother and form of the virtues — is necessary, the same Apostle in the first letter to the Corinthians treats this beautifully and profoundly, and at last truthfully concludes and determines that to speak in the tongues of angels, to know all mysteries, to have faith to move mountains, to feed the poor, to abound in prophecies or in whatever other perfections — where charity is absent, these profit absolutely nothing.

And where charity is not, says the great Pope Gregory, what is there that can profit? But where charity is, what is there that can hinder? For it is the property of charity, as the same Gregory attests, *"to nourish concord, to preserve what has been composed, to join what has been dissociated, to direct what is crooked, and to strengthen the other virtues in their perfection with its protection."*

Since therefore men placed outside of charity — by which God and neighbor are loved — persisting in contentions and quarrels unbecoming to servants of God according to the Apostle, entwined in schisms and discords by which, according to Sallust, great things fall to ruin, never sleeping or resting in peace together, but always thinking and speaking adversely, are absolutely nothing unless perhaps a certain *"sounding brass and tinkling cymbal"* — what wonder if Paul the teacher of the nations, wishing to manifest the fidelity and affection of true love with which he embraced the Philippians, not only earnestly stirs and exhorts them to have charity — which ends discords and removes rancors — but even to have their *"charity abound more and more?"*

Indeed, among the various and manifold effects by which the fidelity and perfect love of one toward another are demonstrated, the catholic commentators are found to have left none more evident in their writings

than the one by which the avoidance of contentions and divisions is counseled, the manner of reconciliation and concord is indicated, and peace — if it can be done — is urged to be sought and maintained with all men.

The Model of Christ and the Apostles

Hence the most pious Savior of the world, whose every action is our instruction, is found to have commended nothing so much to his disciples as concord and peace. *"By this,"* he says, *"all will know that you are my disciples, if you have love"* and concord *"for one another."* Indeed, the sweetest Jesus himself, *"who is our peace, making both one,"* when he was about to pass from this world to the Father, is read to have prayed more especially for what, if not for the unity and concord of his mystical body, which is the Church? *"Father,"* he says, *"I pray that they may be one as we are one."*

And in the letters of Paul, in the canonical letters of John and Peter and the other apostles, of whom you, best of fathers, glory to be the successors — what else is commanded, what else is taught or announced, but the peace and concord of the faithful, and that *"the multitude of believers be of one heart and one soul?"*

And what does it mean that the Spouse of the Church so often calls his spouse one in the Song of Songs, saying: *"one is my dove, one is my chosen, one is my perfect one"* — if not so that the faithful may understand that unity — commended by such frequent repetition of words — pertains to the Church of God in such a way that those are now not of the Church, *"outside which there is no salvation,"* who damnably divide the Church or neglect and disdain to reduce it once divided to unity?

Hence the Spouse himself, plainly showing how greatly any division stirred up *"in his body, which is the Church"* displeases him and how dangerous it is — when speaking to the crowds in figures as his successors watched — taught and practiced the leaving behind of ninety-nine sheep...

On Reconciliation and the Gift Left at the Altar

...to offer what they bring before the altar, if by chance one has something against another — let him go at once, and first be reconciled to his brother. For who would think that those men wish to spend themselves for the souls of their brothers together with the Apostle, who would refuse to diligently seek and procure reconciliation and concord with their brothers on account of whatever injuries or temporal goods or honors, or would refuse to joyfully accept the same when offered?

Was not the mildest of men, Moses — who is described as speaking with God face to face and as so great a punisher of sins that he did not fear, in detestation of the idolatrous sin of the people, to break the tablets written with the finger of God — though he seemed to have great occasion to permit the wrath of God to rage even to the utter destruction of the children of Israel who had so often and so greatly rebelled against him; after weighing equally in the balance the scandals and inconveniences that would come to him from the world, if the people of God entrusted to his care were reduced to almost no number, became a reproach to the nations, and his enemies finally said of him: *"Where is their God?"* — was he not, I say, soon forgetful of the injuries of his fellow citizens according to the precept of the old Law, setting aside for the common good many things particularly due to him by right, frequently reconciling himself with the stiff-necked people, and compelling God to be reconciled with the same people, when he said: *"Either forgive this people their sin, or else blot me out of your book, in which you have written me?"*

A man, since by principles given to him by nature he is, as the philosophers say, a social and political animal, enormously wounds and confounds nature whenever he divides or separates himself from his neighbor — whom, as the canonical letter of John says, *"he who does not love abides in death,"* and *"he who hates him is a murderer."*

What therefore can follow from the division of Christians — especially of ecclesiastics — other than the destruction of themselves and of all Christendom, and the irrevocable transfer to the Gentiles of the priesthood

of Melchizedek founded in eternity? For as the Gospel witnesses and experience teaches too well: *"every kingdom divided against itself shall be desolate,"* and *"all those,"* as the Apostle says, *"who bite and devour one another, shall at length be consumed by one another."*

For what have civil wars and schisms left to the Assyrians, to the Medes and Persians, to the Greeks and Romans, and in our own times to kingdoms and peoples, but a lamentable desolation of their fatherlands, a diminishing of glorious fame, a corruption of morals, and the freedom and license to perpetrate all crimes with impunity?

The Danger of Continued Division

What therefore remains, if the Greeks — God forbid — were not to be united with the Latins, if the Latins were to remain divided among themselves for yet longer? What, I say, remains, unless the terrible God, showing that he *"repented that he made man"* — as he transfers earthly kingdoms from nation to nation on account of iniquities and injustices and various deceits — should likewise subject and hand over the glory of the royal priesthood, both of the Greeks and the Latins, on account of their all too long continued discords, to miserable servitude and the rule of those who *"carry the sword in vengeance against evildoers"* — as is already seen in part to have happened — and it should come to pass at last, as blessed Bernard bitterly laments, that *"the mistress of the nations serve as a slave, and the slave rule as mistress?"*

For if, with the discords among Christians in these pestilential times — so grievous, alas, as are now flourishing, such as none has ever seen since the incarnation of the Word of God — a departure from the Roman Church should happen, as the Hussite heretics and their followers do not cease to desire and to plot day by day; since the blessed Apostle in ii Thessalonians seems plainly to hint that then the end of the world and the last day are at hand, and the coming of that *"son of perdition"* who is called Antichrist is near, when such a departure shall occur — what wise man of sound mind would not fear to see in the very near future coming upon the whole world, especially upon the Church, *"tribulations and anguishes such as the world"*

— since the nations perhaps began — *"has not known,"* unless those ecclesiastics, both Latins and Greeks, at least learning wisdom from vexation, shall swiftly give one another the right hand and receive one another to the embrace of peace that is not feigned but true?

And lest we pass over other testimonies of these dangers — is not the lamentable desolation of many churches, especially cathedral churches, arising without doubt from the struggles and contentions of two altars erected in the Lord's temple, one of which loosens what the other binds, one destroys what the other builds — does this not plainly announce that the aforementioned tribulations are already in act invading the world?

"When you see these things come to pass," says the Savior, "let those who are in Judea flee to the mountain, and let not those who are on the housetop come down to take anything from the house. Woe to those who are with child and to those who give suck in those days."

The Duke of Burgundy's Mission

These tribulations and anguishes — far more to be dreaded than sudden lightning — the most pious and devout prince the Lord Duke of Burgundy, the most obedient son of your holiness, most blessed father, turning over in his heart with careful meditation and striving with his accustomed catholic energy of mind and body to meet them; wisely and wholesomely keeping before his eyes also the fact that the cessation of those same tribulations and the health and rest of your sublime person, most blessed father, and a commendation with God and men enduring into eternity depend singularly on the union of holy mother Church and the peace and concord of the faithful — in order to make publicly manifest the final fidelity, the most fervent and devout affection of sincere love with which he embraces and honors your holiness in deed and in truth, through us here present, the orators and nuncios of his ducal highness, in the depths of perfect charity and in the spirit of all humility and reverence, he humbly supplicates the same holiness: that your piety's eyes, kindly directing themselves to the most dreadful scandals to be immediately disseminated throughout all the regions of Christendom — if, God forbid, deadly seeds of schism should be

sown in the Lord's field specially entrusted to your care, if the Latins should ever more greatly be divided or should remain so divided for longer, so that on account of their contentions and discords the Eastern Church might delay even for a time to unite with the Latin — you may deign to provide swiftly and effectively that no stain of schism may contaminate the Church of God, your spouse.

And that those two most holy works which your holiness has vigorously begun out of charity — to be extolled with eternal praise — namely the union of the Greeks with the Latins, and the reconciliation and concord of the fathers, both the most reverend lords the Cardinals and the other lords and ecclesiastics assembled at Basel, with your holiness — may receive a swift and for the whole world necessary consummation.

For those most holy works — whose happy consummation and enduring permanence are without doubt the most fitting and most necessary means for procuring and establishing perfect union and peace in the catholic Church — the most powerful prince himself desires to become a cooperator and helper to such a degree that for their happy attainment he presents his illustrious person, his fatherlands, all his subjects, and all the most ample and most opulent dominions subject to his magnificence to your holiness and to the holy council with faithful and most cordial affection; and he has specially charged us his ambassadors that in the fervent pursuit of these matters, and of all the other matters concerning the prosperity and honor of holy mother Church and of your holiness and of this present holy council, *"we show ourselves as ministers of God,"* diligently fulfilling in heart and soul each of those great matters that shall be commanded to us by your holiness and by the holy council — as we have ever had and retain in our desires.

Praise of the Duke

O truly catholic Duke! O legitimate son of holy mother Church! Most justly to be honored with the name of Prince of Peace — whose *"daily care"* is, together with the Apostle, *"solicitude for all the churches,"* to *"pray for the peace of Jerusalem,"* to *"preach concord to the nations, to those near and*

to those far," to obtain reconciliation and to remove all scandal from the kingdom of God with everything that is in him.

O the most just and wholly worthy petition of a magnanimous and prudent prince — a petition unknowing of personal advantage, that presses only for the removal of schisms, for the desired union of Latins and Greeks, for the exaltation of the catholic faith, for the common good of Christendom, for the preservation and increase of the commonwealth of the servants of God. A petition which of your holiness, most blessed father, and of this present holy council asks and seeks nothing more than that — in the manner of speaking of the Apostle — *"he who began a good work in you may complete it,"* and that *"the charity of God diffused in your hearts by the Holy Spirit"* may always abound more and more in the continuation of the aforementioned works — so that passers-by, on account of their imperfection or neglect, may not have occasion to wag their heads in dishonor of the apostolic name and say: *"Behold the man who began to build and was not able to finish."* *"And who is there to harm you,"* says the canonical letter of Peter, *"if you are zealous of good?"*

For since *"sustained labor conquers all things"* and according to Seneca *"there is nothing that a wakeful and persistent care does not overcome"* — and since again, according to the gospel parable, the man lying in bed with his children would rise from his bed on account of the importunity of the one knocking at the door and would be compelled to hand over to his friend all the bread he needs — who doubts, most blessed father, if your benevolence, compassionate with the all too great afflictions of the Church, shall deign to continue the aforementioned most holy works — so laudably begun — *"in season and out of season,"* as the Apostle says, that they ought soon to receive that desired consummation, for which a prince of such great authority and excellence so earnestly supplicates, and for whose solicitation and happy attainment he has caused so many sublime and religious men to traverse such great regions?

The Glory That Would Follow

And if this most singular grace — certainly granted to none of your predecessors the Supreme Pontiffs — your holiness, most blessed father, shall find in the eyes of divine piety, and in your days and through your holy prayers and divine directions Latins and Greeks alike under the obedience of the Roman Church shall be gathered and assembled together in the great house of God — to whom, I ask, will the glory be compared, never to be erased by any ages, that is to be won by you from this most glorious triumph? With what reward — besides those owed to *"those who through faith have conquered kingdoms"* — an unusual merit among mortals, nonetheless undoubtedly to be acquired from the persevering continuation of these works, can it be worthily compensated?

And who, finally, even if he were to speak with the tongues of angels, could sufficiently express the most glorious fruits destined to come at last to the whole world from this joyful union of the Eastern and Western Churches *"in one faith, in one spirit, in one baptism,"* in one Lord — attained above all through your labors and at your expense?

Those most glorious labors of yours, most blessed father, if they complete the begun work of the desired union of Latins and Greeks, will give glory to the heavens, emptiness to hell, peace to the world, faith to the nations, an end to vices, and will pour discipline back into morals. And then, if I am not mistaken, those most holy works of yours will receive — hardly otherwise — the summit of the desired perfection, for which the present holy council is recognized to have been convened: the extirpation of heresies, the pacification of Christians, and the so often sought and promised reformation of Christendom — without which *"it will be vain for us to have risen before dawn,"* and those who without it have put their hand to great things will at last be found to have accomplished little, as the prophet says in Jeremiah v: *"You have struck them, but they have not grieved; you have bruised them, but they have refused to receive correction; they have made their faces harder than stone and refused to return. Therefore a lion from the forest has struck them, and a wolf has devoured them at evening."*

But if the Latins — both those residing at Ferrara and those at Basel — should swiftly gather together in one place and enjoy perfect concord in the

Lord; if the Greeks with the Latins should be *"of one mind, feeling and saying the same things"* — who would then presume to doubt the festive and perfect consummation of the aforementioned works? For with this happy and supremely desired union accomplished, since according to the evangelical promise Christ is always present with all gathered in his name, and with them *"praying with the Holy Spirit with unspeakable groanings,"* all things are subjected and obey; and once all errors have been expelled from the Church of God, peace re-established among the princes and peoples of Christendom, and laws renewed or newly issued according to which it befits Christians to live — all flesh will see and rejoice in the golden age flourishing in the times of our lord Pope Eugene **iv** — those golden ages once flourishing in the times of Octavian when Christ was born, during which *"every man sitting securely under his vine rejoiced in the fullness of peace, and swords were turned into plowshares and spears into sickles."*

The Crusade and Liberation

And who finally, looking from afar and knowing great things, does not clearly see: if the Latins and Greeks — who for so many unhappy ages have been lamentably divided, perhaps because there was none who, as our most holy lord does at present, directed their feet in the way of peace — should on this occasion merit to become one heart and one soul; and if again these two nations, most skilled in war, should gird themselves for the overseas passage — to which, with the Lord's bounty, they will be carefully invited through our most holy lord and made effectively disposed — just as many Supreme Pontiffs are found long ago to have fervently stirred all the nobles and commoners of the world to rebuild the fallen walls of Jerusalem and to rescue the Holy Land from the hands of the enemies of Christ — if, I say, this people of God constituted from Greeks and Latins should undertake that second journey, and as once the victorious children of Israel went forth to battle, advance in one column of mind and body against the phalanxes of the Turks and Tartars and other infidels — who would presume to hesitate that the celebrated regions of the Greeks, adorned with illustrious men shining in wisdom, eloquence, gravity of morals, and wondrous virtues and graces, would not in the very near future be happily

liberated from the hands of all their enemies and triumphantly restored to their former glory, second to none in the world?

O if that happy day of Christian glory should arrive — how great will be thought that power which the most powerful prince the Duke of Burgundy preserves for the attainment of so great a prize, and which he will then declare to the world by land and sea with the greatest joy! And who could be so fainthearted or of so abject a condition that, invited to this most glorious contest for the recovery of the Holy Land, he would not straightway, leaving all things, follow Christ and gloriously expose himself to the recovery of the holy city Jerusalem, of Acre, of Damietta, and of the other illustrious cities and lands consecrated by the precious blood and presence of Christ — captured so many times, and most recently (which I say to the shame of modern Christians) by catholic princes and peoples who had been subject to the empire of Christendom — which modern Christians, damnably provoking one another with mutual slaughter and carnage on account of their lack of charity and concord, behold possessed and trampled underfoot by Mohammed and other worshippers of idols, and there is none to help?

ACTUS DECIMUS — Second, Third, and Fourth Days of Collation

Preamble: On Leaving the Sheep to Seek the Lost

...to be left behind in the desert in order to go after the one that was lost, and to bring it back on his own shoulders to the fold in a salutary way — he both taught this and did it. Indeed, when reproved by the Jews because he ate with publicans and sinners, he is constantly read to have answered steadfastly that he was sent only to *"the sheep that were lost of the house of Israel,"* and that *"it is not the healthy who need a physician, but the sick."*

By this, if I am not mistaken, he was vividly intimating to future pastors of the Church how great a necessity rests upon them — in the manner of speaking of the Apostle — *"in season and out of season,"* through *"glory and dishonor, through ill repute and good repute,"* continuously to provide and attend, so that over those whom the Holy Spirit *"has placed to rule the Church of God"* no stain of schism whatsoever arises or remains, and that most mournful and detestable cry does not resound: *"I am of Cephas, I am of Apollo."* For a small spark, if allowed to burn for too long, frequently sets a great forest ablaze — just as blessed Gregory says: *"a sin which is not soon washed away by penance drags the soul by its own weight toward another."*

For what gave such long duration to the most dreadful schism recently concluded at Constance — from which all the deformity in the world arose — if not the failure arising from the negligence of extinguishing the common fire? How quickly did it emit its flames, what could so easily and happily have been extinguished at its beginning without any loss or disgrace to the parties later condemned! So that therefore the consuming flames of schismatic fire in these unhappy days, rushing on all sides *"like sparks running through stubble,"* may not at last be found to have miserably devoured the sheep and sheepfold of Christ — what more useful, what more fitting, what more distinguished counsel can be given or offered to the true vicar of God, the Supreme Pontiff of those sheep, than that for the purpose of resisting so imminent and so dangerous a fire — for whose beginnings, a remedy applied too late would perhaps accomplish nothing — for the purpose of preserving the integrity of the seamless garment which even the cruel soldiers killing Christ did not presume to divide, for the purpose of giving to himself and to the Church of God his spouse peace and quiet, and to *"Greeks and barbarians, to the wise and the unwise"* dispersed far and wide throughout the world — to whom, as the Apostle says, he is a *"debtor"* — that he show such great humanity, demonstrate such clemency, and so condescend with paternal affection to their weaknesses, that noble spirits — who are more easily led than dragged — conquered by affability, benevolence, and gentleness rather than by harshness or fear, setting aside all seedbeds and incentives to schism, may

glory in hastening swiftly to their brothers and companions, laboring — as must altogether come to pass — that of all the sheep of Christ *"there be one fold and one shepherd?"*

To forgive, as a certain wise man attests, is the highest and most noble form of victory. And the ancient histories of the pagans record that the African Scipio, Julius Caesar, and many other conquerors of the world gained more faithful subjects and friends from the peoples rebelling against them by forgiving, showing mercy, and giving generously than by using swords or chains. For since, as the moral philosopher Seneca says, nothing is more base for a man than to make war against one with whom he has always lived as a friend — and since again, wild and brute animals desire peace and concord as naturally as any other beings, so much so that if it happens they are separated from one another, they do not cease to roam in wandering courses, to bellow, to howl, and to emit various roars and cries, until each one has again been joined together with its like — in what way is it fitting for Christians, adorned with the image of the most blessed Trinity, that the harshness of any division should so harden among them that — contrary to the precept of the Apostle — *"the sun should not set upon their anger,"* and that, leaving aside the gift they offer at the altar, if perhaps one has something against another...

Session of 4 December — Tenth Session

On the fourth of December, at the tenth session, with all standing in attendance, the place of the Greek delegates was empty. Each man looked about to see why this had happened. And because between the preceding disputation and this one the solemn legates of the Duke of Burgundy had arrived and had made solemn orations to the Supreme Pontiff and to the Greeks present at the ecumenical council, and had said nothing publicly to the Greek Emperor — now the Bishop of Chalon, one of the orators who had come from the Duke, rose first and said these words to the Emperor: the most illustrious prince the Duke of Burgundy, inflamed with his whole desire for the union of the Greeks, sends these letters to your serenity with

greetings; and since they contain credentials, we are prepared to set them forth in words in the palace of your serenity.

ANDREAS. The Emperor, having received them, sent his interpreter to respond privately to the ambassadors, and then, having returned, the interpreter came back to the ambassadors.

LUDOVICUS. Tell me, I beg, what they set forth.

ANDREAS. Everything that was done through the council we have written down elsewhere; in this treatise we have arranged to set forth nothing other than what concerns the discussion of the faith. But because this exhortation was principally directed toward this union of the faith, I will relate what was gravely set forth by a religious man venerable in age, in years, and in learning — the General Abbot of the Cistercians, who had been the fourth among the orators. For the first in order had been the Bishop of Thérouanne, who, residing at the curia, had been joined by reason of honor and thus said nothing. The second was the Bishop of Chalon, who was the first to speak. But since everything contained in the things set forth by this venerable father is included in his account, those things will appear to have been set forth through his relation. The third was the Bishop of Nevers, who, like the first, maintained silence. The fourth was the aforementioned abbot.

LUDOVICUS. Tell me what the aforementioned father set forth.

ANDREAS. The council was addressed in these words.

THE ORATION FOLLOWS

"If I were weaving a small basket of rushes" — to use the words of blessed Jerome written in his prologue to Job — "or if, plaiting the leaves of palms, in the sweat of my brow I were engaged in the labors of the belly's demand, no mortal would reproach me, nor would I be exposed to be gnawed upon by the bites of detractors, hateful to God."

But now, when I, unlearned in knowledge and in speech, appear to seek things beyond me against the teaching of the wise, and dare in my foolishness to attempt a most arduous work — one for which a more mature eloquence than mine would have been more fitting — namely to declare the ends desirable for every catholic, to wit: the perfect union of the Eastern Church with the Latin, the concord and peace of the fathers, both the most reverend lords the Cardinals and the other lords and ecclesiastics assembled at Basel, with your holiness, most blessed father — ends which the most devoted son of holy mother Church, the Lord Philip by the grace of God Duke of Burgundy, pursues and intends with untiring labors and continual sighs, and who has sent us here present, the orators and nuncios of his ducal highness, to the same holiness and to this present holy council — if, most blessed father and holy synod, the kindness innate to you shall have borne with my imperfection, alas too soon to be revealed, what occasion of succor will there be for me, so that those *"who sit in the gate and those who drink wine"* may not speak in mockery against me?

But because I will not strive to speak from my own resources, but it is my mind to set forth only those things which that most wise prince himself has placed in my mouth, I have therefore conceived great confidence that — if not by my merits, yet in contemplation of and reverence for so great and so catholic a prince — your mercies will patiently bear with my ignorance, and that the Father of mercies, who *"makes even the tongues of infants eloquent,"* will make my words right and well-sounding in your ears.

Fortified by this hope, and specifically relying on this protestation — that all things to be said by me I submit entirely to the correction and determination of your holiness, most blessed father, and of this present holy council — I will endeavor to discharge quickly the second part of the exposition to be made by us orators before this most excellent audience, left to me by the reverend father in Christ the Lord Bishop of Chalon, as it shall be granted to me from on high.

Presuppositions and the Purpose of the Oration

Having presupposed the most well-known truths — which are made clear far more by deed than by word — with which the oration of that reverend father in Christ the Lord Bishop of Chalon, both eloquent and well-spoken, elegantly and abundantly declared the most illustrious prince the Lord Duke of Burgundy to be the most obedient son of your holiness, most blessed father, and to be distinguished in manifold ways in the exalting of his virtues and the amplest titles of his dignities — for some declaration of the means by which that most powerful prince trusts and desires that his most holy desires regarding the procuring and establishing of union and peace in the Church of God may be effectively fulfilled, and for the practical and fervent pursuit of all these things — he sends to the same holiness of yours and to this present holy council these so many and so great reverend, magnificent, noble, and distinguished men, across such great and dangerous stretches of roads: I am not ashamed to set forth in advance the words which the blessed Apostle is read to have directed long ago to the Philippians in the first chapter of his letter to the Philippians, when exhorting them to complete the work they had begun, saying: *"I pray that your charity may abound more and more."*

The understanding of these words is easily grasped from the causes of speaking, if the mind's eye is fixed for a moment on the deduction of the Apostle — who, after having made the Philippians confident of the happy completion of the work begun by them, saying: *"I am confident that he who began a good work in you will bring it to completion until the day of Christ Jesus,"* showing again plainly that he wished to be a cooperator and helper of such a work, immediately added this: *"I pray that your charity may abound more and more."*

On Charity as the Foundation of All Good Works

For since for the beginning and completion of every good work the virtue of charity — which theologians call the mother and form of the virtues — is necessary, the same Apostle in the first letter to the Corinthians treats this beautifully and profoundly, and at last truthfully concludes and determines

that to speak in the tongues of angels, to know all mysteries, to have faith to move mountains, to feed the poor, to abound in prophecies or in whatever other perfections — where charity is absent, these profit absolutely nothing.

And where charity is not, says the great Pope Gregory, what is there that can profit? But where charity is, what is there that can hinder? For it is the property of charity, as the same Gregory attests, *"to nourish concord, to preserve what has been composed, to join what has been dissociated, to direct what is crooked, and to strengthen the other virtues in their perfection with its protection."*

Since therefore men placed outside of charity — by which God and neighbor are loved — persisting in contentions and quarrels unbecoming to servants of God according to the Apostle, entwined in schisms and discords by which, according to Sallust, great things fall to ruin, never sleeping or resting in peace together, but always thinking and speaking adversely, are absolutely nothing unless perhaps a certain *"sounding brass and tinkling cymbal"* — what wonder if Paul the teacher of the nations, wishing to manifest the fidelity and affection of true love with which he embraced the Philippians, not only earnestly stirs and exhorts them to have charity — which ends discords and removes rancors — but even to have their *"charity abound more and more?"*

Indeed, among the various and manifold effects by which the fidelity and perfect love of one toward another are demonstrated, the catholic commentators are found to have left none more evident in their writings than the one by which the avoidance of contentions and divisions is counseled, the manner of reconciliation and concord is indicated, and peace — if it can be done — is urged to be sought and maintained with all men.

The Model of Christ and the Apostles

Hence the most pious Savior of the world, whose every action is our instruction, is found to have commended nothing so much to his disciples as concord and peace. *"By this,"* he says, *"all will know that you are my disciples, if you have love"* and concord *"for one another."* Indeed, the sweetest Jesus himself, *"who is our peace, making both one,"* when he was about to pass from this world to the Father, is read to have prayed more especially for what, if not for the unity and concord of his mystical body, which is the Church? *"Father,"* he says, *"I pray that they may be one as we are one."*

And in the letters of Paul, in the canonical letters of John and Peter and the other apostles, of whom you, best of fathers, glory to be the successors — what else is commanded, what else is taught or announced, but the peace and concord of the faithful, and that *"the multitude of believers be of one heart and one soul?"*

And what does it mean that the Spouse of the Church so often calls his spouse one in the Song of Songs, saying: *"one is my dove, one is my chosen, one is my perfect one"* — if not so that the faithful may understand that unity — commended by such frequent repetition of words — pertains to the Church of God in such a way that those are now not of the Church, *"outside which there is no salvation,"* who damnably divide the Church or neglect and disdain to reduce it once divided to unity?

Hence the Spouse himself, plainly showing how greatly any division stirred up *"in his body, which is the Church"* displeases him and how dangerous it is — when speaking to the crowds in figures as his successors watched — taught and practiced the leaving behind of ninety-nine sheep...

On Reconciliation and the Gift Left at the Altar

...to offer what they bring before the altar, if by chance one has something against another — let him go at once, and first be reconciled to his brother. For who would think that those men wish to spend themselves for the souls

of their brothers together with the Apostle, who would refuse to diligently seek and procure reconciliation and concord with their brothers on account of whatever injuries or temporal goods or honors, or would refuse to joyfully accept the same when offered?

Was not the mildest of men, Moses — who is described as speaking with God face to face and as so great a punisher of sins that he did not fear, in detestation of the idolatrous sin of the people, to break the tablets written with the finger of God — though he seemed to have great occasion to permit the wrath of God to rage even to the utter destruction of the children of Israel who had so often and so greatly rebelled against him; after weighing equally in the balance the scandals and inconveniences that would come to him from the world, if the people of God entrusted to his care were reduced to almost no number, became a reproach to the nations, and his enemies finally said of him: *"Where is their God?"* — was he not, I say, soon forgetful of the injuries of his fellow citizens according to the precept of the old Law, setting aside for the common good many things particularly due to him by right, frequently reconciling himself with the stiff-necked people, and compelling God to be reconciled with the same people, when he said: *"Either forgive this people their sin, or else blot me out of your book, in which you have written me?"*

A man, since by principles given to him by nature he is, as the philosophers say, a social and political animal, enormously wounds and confounds nature whenever he divides or separates himself from his neighbor — whom, as the canonical letter of John says, *"he who does not love abides in death,"* and *"he who hates him is a murderer."*

What therefore can follow from the division of Christians — especially of ecclesiastics — other than the destruction of themselves and of all Christendom, and the irrevocable transfer to the Gentiles of the priesthood of Melchizedek founded in eternity? For as the Gospel witnesses and experience teaches too well: *"every kingdom divided against itself shall be desolate,"* and *"all those,"* as the Apostle says, *"who bite and devour one another, shall at length be consumed by one another."*

For what have civil wars and schisms left to the Assyrians, to the Medes and Persians, to the Greeks and Romans, and in our own times to kingdoms and peoples, but a lamentable desolation of their fatherlands, a diminishing of glorious fame, a corruption of morals, and the freedom and license to perpetrate all crimes with impunity?

The Danger of Continued Division

What therefore remains, if the Greeks — God forbid — were not to be united with the Latins, if the Latins were to remain divided among themselves for yet longer? What, I say, remains, unless the terrible God, showing that he *"repented that he made man"* — as he transfers earthly kingdoms from nation to nation on account of iniquities and injustices and various deceits — should likewise subject and hand over the glory of the royal priesthood, both of the Greeks and the Latins, on account of their all too long continued discords, to miserable servitude and the rule of those who *"carry the sword in vengeance against evildoers"* — as is already seen in part to have happened — and it should come to pass at last, as blessed Bernard bitterly laments, that *"the mistress of the nations serve as a slave, and the slave rule as mistress?"*

For if, with the discords among Christians in these pestilential times — so grievous, alas, as are now flourishing, such as none has ever seen since the incarnation of the Word of God — a departure from the Roman Church should happen, as the Hussite heretics and their followers do not cease to desire and to plot day by day; since the blessed Apostle in **ii** Thessalonians seems plainly to hint that then the end of the world and the last day are at hand, and the coming of that *"son of perdition"* who is called Antichrist is near, when such a departure shall occur — what wise man of sound mind would not fear to see in the very near future coming upon the whole world, especially upon the Church, *"tribulations and anguishes such as the world"* — since the nations perhaps began — *"has not known,"* unless those ecclesiastics, both Latins and Greeks, at least learning wisdom from

vexation, shall swiftly give one another the right hand and receive one another to the embrace of peace that is not feigned but true?

And lest we pass over other testimonies of these dangers — is not the lamentable desolation of many churches, especially cathedral churches, arising without doubt from the struggles and contentions of two altars erected in the Lord's temple, one of which loosens what the other binds, one destroys what the other builds — does this not plainly announce that the aforementioned tribulations are already in act invading the world?

"When you see these things come to pass," says the Savior, "let those who are in Judea flee to the mountain, and let not those who are on the housetop come down to take anything from the house. Woe to those who are with child and to those who give suck in those days."

The Duke of Burgundy's Mission

These tribulations and anguishes — far more to be dreaded than sudden lightning — the most pious and devout prince the Lord Duke of Burgundy, the most obedient son of your holiness, most blessed father, turning over in his heart with careful meditation and striving with his accustomed catholic energy of mind and body to meet them; wisely and wholesomely keeping before his eyes also the fact that the cessation of those same tribulations and the health and rest of your sublime person, most blessed father, and a commendation with God and men enduring into eternity depend singularly on the union of holy mother Church and the peace and concord of the faithful — in order to make publicly manifest the final fidelity, the most fervent and devout affection of sincere love with which he embraces and honors your holiness in deed and in truth, through us here present, the orators and nuncios of his ducal highness, in the depths of perfect charity and in the spirit of all humility and reverence, he humbly supplicates the same holiness: that your piety's eyes, kindly directing themselves to the most dreadful scandals to be immediately disseminated throughout all the regions of Christendom — if, God forbid, deadly seeds of schism should be sown in the Lord's field specially entrusted to your care, if the Latins should

ever more greatly be divided or should remain so divided for longer, so that on account of their contentions and discords the Eastern Church might delay even for a time to unite with the Latin — you may deign to provide swiftly and effectively that no stain of schism may contaminate the Church of God, your spouse.

And that those two most holy works which your holiness has vigorously begun out of charity — to be extolled with eternal praise — namely the union of the Greeks with the Latins, and the reconciliation and concord of the fathers, both the most reverend lords the Cardinals and the other lords and ecclesiastics assembled at Basel, with your holiness — may receive a swift and for the whole world necessary consummation.

For those most holy works — whose happy consummation and enduring permanence are without doubt the most fitting and most necessary means for procuring and establishing perfect union and peace in the catholic Church — the most powerful prince himself desires to become a cooperator and helper to such a degree that for their happy attainment he presents his illustrious person, his fatherlands, all his subjects, and all the most ample and most opulent dominions subject to his magnificence to your holiness and to the holy council with faithful and most cordial affection; and he has specially charged us his ambassadors that in the fervent pursuit of these matters, and of all the other matters concerning the prosperity and honor of holy mother Church and of your holiness and of this present holy council, *"we show ourselves as ministers of God,"* diligently fulfilling in heart and soul each of those great matters that shall be commanded to us by your holiness and by the holy council — as we have ever had and retain in our desires.

Praise of the Duke

O truly catholic Duke! O legitimate son of holy mother Church! Most justly to be honored with the name of Prince of Peace — whose *"daily care"* is, together with the Apostle, *"solicitude for all the churches,"* to *"pray for the*

peace of Jerusalem," to "preach concord to the nations, to those near and to those far," to obtain reconciliation and to remove all scandal from the kingdom of God with everything that is in him.

O the most just and wholly worthy petition of a magnanimous and prudent prince — a petition unknowing of personal advantage, that presses only for the removal of schisms, for the desired union of Latins and Greeks, for the exaltation of the catholic faith, for the common good of Christendom, for the preservation and increase of the commonwealth of the servants of God. A petition which of your holiness, most blessed father, and of this present holy council asks and seeks nothing more than that — in the manner of speaking of the Apostle — *"he who began a good work in you may complete it,"* and that *"the charity of God diffused in your hearts by the Holy Spirit"* may always abound more and more in the continuation of the aforementioned works — so that passers-by, on account of their imperfection or neglect, may not have occasion to wag their heads in dishonor of the apostolic name and say: *"Behold the man who began to build and was not able to finish."* *"And who is there to harm you,"* says the canonical letter of Peter, *"if you are zealous of good?"*

For since *"sustained labor conquers all things"* and according to Seneca *"there is nothing that a wakeful and persistent care does not overcome"* — and since again, according to the gospel parable, the man lying in bed with his children would rise from his bed on account of the importunity of the one knocking at the door and would be compelled to hand over to his friend all the bread he needs — who doubts, most blessed father, if your benevolence, compassionate with the all too great afflictions of the Church, shall deign to continue the aforementioned most holy works — so laudably begun — *"in season and out of season,"* as the Apostle says, that they ought soon to receive that desired consummation, for which a prince of such great authority and excellence so earnestly supplicates, and for whose solicitation and happy attainment he has caused so many sublime and religious men to traverse such great regions?

The Glory That Would Follow

And if this most singular grace — certainly granted to none of your predecessors the Supreme Pontiffs — your holiness, most blessed father, shall find in the eyes of divine piety, and in your days and through your holy prayers and divine directions Latins and Greeks alike under the obedience of the Roman Church shall be gathered and assembled together in the great house of God — to whom, I ask, will the glory be compared, never to be erased by any ages, that is to be won by you from this most glorious triumph? With what reward — besides those owed to *"those who through faith have conquered kingdoms"* — an unusual merit among mortals, nonetheless undoubtedly to be acquired from the persevering continuation of these works, can it be worthily compensated?

And who, finally, even if he were to speak with the tongues of angels, could sufficiently express the most glorious fruits destined to come at last to the whole world from this joyful union of the Eastern and Western Churches *"in one faith, in one spirit, in one baptism,"* in one Lord — attained above all through your labors and at your expense?

Those most glorious labors of yours, most blessed father, if they complete the begun work of the desired union of Latins and Greeks, will give glory to the heavens, emptiness to hell, peace to the world, faith to the nations, an end to vices, and will pour discipline back into morals. And then, if I am not mistaken, those most holy works of yours will receive — hardly otherwise — the summit of the desired perfection, for which the present holy council is recognized to have been convened: the extirpation of heresies, the pacification of Christians, and the so often sought and promised reformation of Christendom — without which *"it will be vain for us to have risen before dawn,"* and those who without it have put their hand to great things will at last be found to have accomplished little, as the prophet says in Jeremiah v: *"You have struck them, but they have not grieved; you have bruised them, but they have refused to receive correction; they have made their faces harder than stone and refused to return. Therefore a lion from the forest has struck them, and a wolf has devoured them at evening."*

But if the Latins — both those residing at Ferrara and those at Basel — should swiftly gather together in one place and enjoy perfect concord in the Lord; if the Greeks with the Latins should be *"of one mind, feeling and saying the same things"* — who would then presume to doubt the festive and perfect consummation of the aforementioned works? For with this happy and supremely desired union accomplished, since according to the evangelical promise Christ is always present with all gathered in his name, and with them *"praying with the Holy Spirit with unspeakable groanings,"* all things are subjected and obey; and once all errors have been expelled from the Church of God, peace re-established among the princes and peoples of Christendom, and laws renewed or newly issued according to which it befits Christians to live — all flesh will see and rejoice in the golden age flourishing in the times of our lord Pope Eugene **iv** — those golden ages once flourishing in the times of Octavian when Christ was born, during which *"every man sitting securely under his vine rejoiced in the fullness of peace, and swords were turned into plowshares and spears into sickles."*

The Crusade and Liberation

And who finally, looking from afar and knowing great things, does not clearly see: if the Latins and Greeks — who for so many unhappy ages have been lamentably divided, perhaps because there was none who, as our most holy lord does at present, directed their feet in the way of peace — should on this occasion merit to become one heart and one soul; and if again these two nations, most skilled in war, should gird themselves for the overseas passage — to which, with the Lord's bounty, they will be carefully invited through our most holy lord and made effectively disposed — just as many Supreme Pontiffs are found long ago to have fervently stirred all the nobles and commoners of the world to rebuild the fallen walls of Jerusalem and to rescue the Holy Land from the hands of the enemies of Christ — if, I say, this people of God constituted from Greeks and Latins should undertake that second journey, and as once the victorious children of Israel went forth to battle, advance in one column of mind and body against the

phalanxes of the Turks and Tartars and other infidels — who would presume to hesitate that the celebrated regions of the Greeks, adorned with illustrious men shining in wisdom, eloquence, gravity of morals, and wondrous virtues and graces, would not in the very near future be happily liberated from the hands of all their enemies and triumphantly restored to their former glory, second to none in the world?

O if that happy day of Christian glory should arrive — how great will be thought that power which the most powerful prince the Duke of Burgundy preserves for the attainment of so great a prize, and which he will then declare to the world by land and sea with the greatest joy! And who could be so fainthearted or of so abject a condition that, invited to this most glorious contest for the recovery of the Holy Land, he would not straightway, leaving all things, follow Christ and gloriously expose himself to the recovery of the holy city Jerusalem, of Acre, of Damietta, and of the other illustrious cities and lands consecrated by the precious blood and presence of Christ — captured so many times, and most recently (which I say to the shame of modern Christians) by catholic princes and peoples who had been subject to the empire of Christendom — which modern Christians, damnably provoking one another with mutual slaughter and carnage on account of their lack of charity and concord, behold possessed and trampled underfoot by Mohammed and other worshippers of idols, and there is none to help?

Final Praise of Charity and Concord

O ineffable and incomparable mother Charity! O inestimable gift of God, Concord — to those above all other virtues whom the divine mercy deigns to grant this prerogative, that through their mediation and aid the Church of God may win union and peace, the Holy Land liberation from the hands of the enemies of Christ, the Greeks and Latins victory and triumph over their enemies, hell and the demons destruction and confusion, the holy angels the glad restoration of their seats, and the blessed Trinity at last everlasting glory and praise!

May she therefore live and ever more and more abound in your most pious heart, most blessed father — as we here, humble orators and nuncios together with our most illustrious and powerful prince our lord the Duke of Burgundy, most devoutly beseech: this happy and supremely praiseworthy mother Charity, who nourishes her children with the breasts of such great consolation, and who, possessing all things, never seeks what is her own, but always seeks and puts first what belongs to Christ Jesus.

May she live also and reign over you, most glorious princes of the peoples, priests and ministers of the Lord, gathered in this holy synod with the God of Abraham. And as we orators of so great a prince humbly beseech your most reverend paternities once more: may your charity so always abound more and more that through your continual labors and studies and your wholesome counsels, between our most holy lord and the most reverend father lords the Cardinals and the other lords and ecclesiastics assembled at Basel, peace, concord, and perfect reconciliation — as our prince judges it supremely necessary for the preservation of catholic Christendom — may be swiftly and effectively procured and receive their long-delayed fulfillment.

And beyond this, may the daughter of charity — Concord, *"beautiful as the moon, choice as the sun"* — always live, rule, and reign over you and over them; through whom, as daily experience teaches, small things grow, great and arduous works — such as those you hold in your hands — attain a happy and solid end, victories are won and the security of good things is present, the fear and grief of losing what has been acquired are dispelled, joy and gladness are generated and remain in souls, and at last a triumphant state is achieved, perfect in the aggregate of all goods — as it is written: *"Blessed are the meek, for they shall possess the earth"* and *"blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God"* — in the present through grace and in the future through the beatific vision of God, which the Holy Spirit — the charity, bond, and love of Father and Son — may deign to bestow on all who labor and pray for the peace and concord of Christians, both Latins and Greeks, world without end. Amen.

Return of the Greek Delegates

ANDREAS. This was the speech of a most religious man, delivered with no less gravity than affection and charity. These things therefore were held at the preceding day's session; at this session the foregoing words were spoken to the Emperor. And straightway the interpreter, with our six deputies sitting in their place, said:

INTERPRETER. If it please you that our deputies come forward to say something, it pleases the lord Emperor.

CARDINAL. It is agreeable.

ANDREAS. The six appointed delegates from the Greeks now came for the first time to their place, and the Archbishop of Ephesus spoke these words to the assembly.

The Bishop of Ephesus Opens the Discussion

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Now, under God's guidance, we continue our speech, and with God's help we will begin to respond to the things said by the lord Cardinal. We will thus inquire into the intention and true meaning of the prohibition now under discussion between us — an inquiry which we must make from the things set forth in the definition and law and speeches, and from the things written in letters given in various places in accordance with the prohibition. We earnestly ask you, reverend fathers, to please give brief answers whenever it is necessary to ask a question. And let us say: respond either by assent or by negation; for in this way our disputation will proceed and we will be able more easily to find the truth we seek. But if when we question you on some doubtful matter, wishing to receive from you a yes or no according to the law of the dialecticians, you respond with lengthy speeches and involved and various answers, it will be fitting for us to make more lengthy treatments — and in this way we will come to a conclusion only with difficulty. Let your answer be yes, or according to the Lord's rule, no. And certainly, if your lordship should wish to say something more broadly in due course, and to show the matter more clearly, after the responses that we are to give in the refutation of your arguments, whatever you have to say in confutation of ours you will be able to say confidently,

and we will hear it willingly. All these things must be treated briefly and by decisive steps among us, so that, with a conclusion established, we may be able to proceed to further matters. Indeed, we ourselves shall observe the same order when we have been questioned on some matter. Let what has been said in the opening remarks suffice; now at last let us enter the subject itself.

That Charisius contributes nothing to the confirmation of your argument; for it has been conceded in many respects by you as well that that profession of his, or exposition of his faith, was particular and private and ought not to be esteemed as common. But this was prohibited neither in those times nor after. For this reason Charisius was rightly not reproved, since he read nothing worthy of reproof — since he had not handed on a common creed, but a private faith.

Finally, the claim that those fathers wished to understand "*another faith*" as meaning a contrary faith is contrary to their intention and to the law. That this is repugnant to the force and meaning of the law is made clear by the fact that "*different*" is one thing and "*contrary*" another. For every contrary is different, but not the reverse: for black is contrary to white, but tawny is not contrary to it but altogether different. Also, a musician is not at all contrary to white, but different. And it is absurd to understand a universal negative as meaning a particular. For what is simply negated must be understood universally. And if someone said that a stone is not an animal, he would not only deny that it is not this particular animal, but that the stone is not any animal whatsoever. Therefore those fathers who prohibited "*another faith*" prohibited not only a contrary one, but every other, whether varied in words or in any letter. Does it seem to you that every different thing is contrary? We ask your paternity whether "*different*" differs from "*contrary*."

CARDINAL. Reverend father, your paternity has exhorted me to brevity; the purpose of this holy council is not brevity, but the finding or declaration of truth. Hence whatever leads to finding the truth we must not refuse, since it is our end. Therefore I ask your paternity not to impose a law on me, as I do not impose one on you, because it is necessary that this matter be well discussed. But I wish to give another remedy, by which I will not

burden you if I am lengthy, nor you me if you are lengthy. Let us not make such long intervals of days, but what is not done today, let it be done tomorrow — and in a few days we will finish; and in this way in two days we will accomplish more than in one month as we do now, and we will come to an end. Nevertheless I wish to be brief; but I first wish to say some things for the final declaration, and afterwards I will respond word for word.

God has placed in your mouth that word, so that you cited the word of Christ, that we should say *"yes, yes; no, no"* — and this will profit the declaration of our matter. I ask: when some people asked the holy fathers to declare something and they did not respond *"yes"* but at greater length — did they transgress the precept of Christ? Certainly if we wish to understand the word literally, all who wrote long treatises would have transgressed the commandment of Christ. But the words of Christ are to be understood not according to the literal sense, but according to the intention — so that they respond to truth, not that what is not be added, as he said: *"what is more than this is from evil."* And this I have from blessed Agathon, who says in the synodal letter that faith admits neither increase nor diminution, but as Scripture says, it must be: *"yes, yes,"* and *"what is more than this is from evil."* And blessed Agathon understands that nothing is to be added to the faith that savors of evil, but the truth is to be expounded. He does not understand that no response is to be made except through the word *"yes, yes; no, no"* — for he himself would have transgressed this, who said many things.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. I wish to respond.

CARDINAL. Let me finish. I wish to cite two synodal letters which declare how those words are to be taken, and they will bear on your question. And the i letter is that of the Council of Ephesus to the Emperor Theodosius; and to dispatch it briefly —

EMPEROR. The Lord Bishop of Ephesus has not finished.

CARDINAL. Hear patiently. The letter says that the synod had been assembled to confirm the faith and to depose from all dignities those who

hold corrupted views. Hence this letter declares that those words "*another faith*" are to be understood as referring to those who hold a corrupted faith, because those are the ones who are deposed — those who hold a corrupted faith.

Second, I prove the meaning of that law from another letter. There is another letter beginning "*Concerning piety*," addressed to the Emperor, which says that the bishops who came to the synod on behalf of Pope Celestine set forth the meaning of piety and of the right faith, and that they defined charity and faith in harmony with the Ephesian fathers — and that those who held otherwise were to be deposed from all dignity. Hence that prohibition — which says that one who preaches another faith is to be deposed — is understood of those who preach outside of charity and the faith, although the declaration and true meaning of that prohibition have already been stated in the preceding remarks.

But if I now show you through the declaration of a general council the declaration of those words — must you not rightly be silent? That Council of Chalcedon, speaking to the Emperor Marcian, excuses blessed Leo who expounded the faith, and says that some thought that no one was permitted to expound the faith except the fathers who were at Nicaea. The synod says that because of arising errors it is permitted to others. And afterwards the synod begins to expound the creed: "*I believe*," etc. And it says that because of errors, at Constantinople it was added: "*and I believe in the Holy Spirit*." Likewise, Basil and Damasus were compelled to make other declarations; then it says that because of the error of Nestorius the Council of Ephesus was compelled to expound. I beg you and you the Emperor to note: the synod continues and says: perhaps some think that we should stop at the Council of Ephesus and go no further, because at the Council of Ephesus it was prohibited to make another faith.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. What do you say?

CARDINAL. The address of the synod to Marcian begins in this way, and begins: "*And these things indeed...*"

Reading of the Chalcedonian Text

EMPEROR. Let the text be read.

CARDINAL. These are the words of the text: *"So also at Ephesus, what was doubted concerning the Mother of the Lord was confirmed in writing";* then it says that they declared the truth, and adds: it follows that *"the faith should remain up to this point,"* and that this precept ought to be promulgated to heretics. For *"the precept removes men from the attack on truth, but does not prohibit pastors from defending it."*

BISHOP OF EPHEBUS. It makes no mention of the prohibition.

CARDINAL. The Council of Chalcedon says that the Council of Ephesus confirmed in writing the matter of the Mother of God; therefore — according to you — afterwards it is not permitted to add more in writing about the faith, because the prohibition was made. From this it appears that the council says that that prohibition about not adding to the faith is addressed to heretics, not to those who hold the true faith, and has its place among those who attack the truth. And it adds: if anyone corrupts the understandings of the fathers, he is held liable to the penalty of transgression of the precept. The Council of Ephesus binds those who corrupt the understandings of the fathers — not those who speak the truth. Therefore we now have the declared understanding of that prohibition of the Third Council of Ephesus, and it is not I who give that understanding — it is the Council of Chalcedon. Why do we labor any further, when we have the truth?

EMPEROR. Reverend lord, your side has said more than it intended. And you have never permitted our side to speak, because before the fathers have completed a response, you add further — either the same things or new ones — and in this way this matter will never be able to reach a good conclusion. It is necessary that you hear the complete responses which our side will make.

CARDINAL. Lord Emperor, you are here for no other purpose than to hear the truth. I say nothing extraneous. Your side makes an argument; I set

forth what is necessary for the resolution of that argument — since in the world there can be found no greater declaration than that of a synod. And those who have a doubt, having heard this declaration, should no longer have a doubt, since the council declares that the prohibition encompasses those who corrupt the sentences of the fathers.

EMPEROR. We do not hinder the inquiry into truth — indeed I came here for this very purpose. But the discovery of truth must be made with its proper method and not without method. For if it is granted that one side always speaks and the other does not respond, it will not be possible to judge what the truth is. If the disputations were to proceed in order, the matter would also go well. And since our side says a few words, and in the responses you say many things and sometimes irrelevant ones — therefore the matter will not be able to reach a conclusion.

CARDINAL. Just as it caused no impediment to wait for you for twenty-four days — do not let it weary you to wait for an hour, so that the truth may be seen, since all the things said are conclusive. I come to the response.

You said two things: **first**, that Charisius gave us nothing, because he gave his own private exposition of faith, which was not prohibited. I say that Charisius gave us a great deal, and that through his creed it is evident that the prohibition does not have the meaning as you understand it.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. I do not believe something is called a creed unless it is public and common, and that the faith of Charisius is not called a creed.

CARDINAL. I will show that you yourselves have brought forward the point that a creed also belongs to private persons.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. I do not recall this.

On the Definition of a Creed

CARDINAL. These things are in writing, and I say I will show that it is a true creed. I also declare that a private creed exists, through a certain letter

of the Council of Chalcedon, which says that a creed is interpreted by the fathers and is a collation or pact which a man makes with God — it was also found saying that a creed is a collation or pact made with God through a man. It is the letter of the Council of Chalcedon of the three chapters; and it exists; the letter begins: *"of the three chapters."*

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Who wrote it?

CARDINAL. It is in the Council of Chalcedon. Likewise I will prove it in another way. You intimate that a profession of faith made by one person is not called a creed. I will prove through the letter of Adrian to the Seventh Council that the profession of faith made by Tarasius is called a creed. And in two places Adrian calls it the creed of Tarasius; therefore a creed is a profession of faith, even if it is not made by the universal Church, but by any person whatsoever. Likewise I prove it from the text that precedes the definition in the Third Synod, because those who brought back those bishops handed it on in the manner of a creed. Therefore it is called a creed, even if not a common one. Hence I ask: what is a creed?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Even if what is said may be called a private creed, it does not harm us.

CARDINAL. I called it a creed because you yourselves always called it the creed of Charisius; you ought not to argue against me if I use your own words; you ought not to contradict yourselves.

EMPEROR. This does not cause harm.

CARDINAL. These men ought not to have interrupted me, and ought not to have led me to prove these things. I say that Charisius gave a great deal, because when he presented his creed and the synod did not reprove it — it therefore follows that it is not prohibited to make another creed, provided it be faithful.

As to what you say — that it is permitted privately but not universally — I said yesterday that if that text has the meaning you give it, you expressly speak against the text. For it says: *"let no one be permitted to put forward*

another faith" — therefore it prohibits every one, since it is a universal negative. Then it gives a penalty even to a private individual, because it says: "*a layman*" in the singular. Therefore it has application to the particular, and thus the text would contradict your understanding.

Second: you said in the **ii** argument that this law must be understood universally, because it must encompass not only what is contrary but also what is different, so as to encompass whatever is other. I turn this against you, because if it is understood as you wish, then it will be prohibited both privately and universally.

Third: I say that what you say is repugnant to both natural and civil reason, because it seems unreasonable that it should be prohibited to the universal Church and not to a private person. And it is sufficiently answered as to the **i** argument.

On the Distinction Between "Contrary" and "Different"

I come to the **ii**. You say that the law must not be understood against its own intention. And you say that this law is to be understood simply and universally; and since both contrary and different are encompassed in this word "*other*" — and since contrary is other than different, because white is contrary to black but a musician is different — hence it should prohibit not so much another, that is, contrary, but different.

I respond to the argument. And I will say what Jerome responded to the Luciferian in a certain disputation. Blessed Jerome cited many authorities against the Luciferian, then cited the determination of the universal council. And he says: "*I could, with these words of the universal church*" — understanding the determination of the universal council — "*dry up all the rivulets of your disputation.*" I have the determination of the universal council, which settles that prohibition. It therefore suffices for us; and whatever you shall say about this matter, I refute it — since the Church thus declares it — and this response would be sufficient for everything.

But lest we appear to be lacking in responses, I add more. I will give a legal response, in which I have particularly professed to understand the laws — and which pertains more, perhaps, to jurists than to any other discipline. Our disputation, which is positive only...

...it creeps in that although the text speaks universally, it is nonetheless restricted by what precedes and follows. Could I not be argued against for prolixity? I said yesterday from many antecedents and sequents that the word "*other*" is to be understood of what is contrary, not of what is different. Likewise, when a contradiction would result, a restriction must also be made. Since therefore I have proved that it is to be understood of what is contrary — your argument does not proceed, and you give no response whatsoever to my arguments.

And I prove that the word "*other*" is not to be taken universally. What you say could proceed if there were some term that was equivocal and had several meanings under it. If there were multiple faiths to be found, perhaps what you say could proceed; but there is only one faith, because the Apostle says: "*one God and one faith.*" Therefore when "*another faith*" is said, it is fitting to understand it as contrary — just as if it is said: "*do not worship another god,*" that word "*another*" is understood as meaning false. So here, when "*another faith*" is said — that is, a false and heretical faith. And by these things the argument is answered. If you wish to say something, say it briefly, and I will respond briefly.

ARCHBISHOP OF KOLOSSI. From the Greek word it is declared that this word "*other*" is understood of what is contrary; and when it is said in Greek *theoroseon* (ἐτέραν — another/different), it is understood as different. Therefore when "*other*" is said, it means contrary according to the Greeks.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. I am pleased — what shall I say?

CARDINAL. I am pleased; today, and tomorrow, and the day after — say as much as you like until nightfall.

Greek Perspective on "Contrary" vs. "Different"

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. I will respond to the Archbishop of Kolossi. When your paternity said you wished to prove the contrary through the Greek word: names are fittingly and appropriately applied to those things for which they are used. When your paternity mentioned that word *theoroseon* — that is, a contrary opinion — I say that it rather supports our understanding.

ARCHBISHOP OF KOLOSSI. Show this.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. For you understand *theoroseon* to mean a contrary faith. For one faith is true, and many are false and deceitful; and every opinion that would be other than the true opinion must of necessity be false. Therefore every *theoroseon* (ἕτερον — other) must of necessity have one that is contrary — this supports our argument. For since the one true faith was handed on at the Nicene Council, and this must be one both in meaning and in words, every other faith — whether regarding meaning or words — is prohibited. Therefore what you said works in our favor. For *another opinion* must necessarily be contrary with regard to meaning, and another must necessarily be contrary with regard to words.

ARCHBISHOP OF KOLOSSI. You said two things from which you said that I support your opinion; if this is true, show it. **Second**, you said *theoroseon* — that is, *different* — to mean *contrary* with regard to meaning or with regard to words. I wish to show that this response cannot proceed either according to the philosophers or according to the theologians.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Bear with me while I speak more clearly.

ARCHBISHOP OF KOLOSSI. I am pleased.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. I said thus: that the word "*another opinion*" must always be understood as false, since there is one true opinion. But the word "*another true exposition*" of the creed must also necessarily be understood as both contrary and different, because it is changed according to the words; many expositions can be made, just as there are many opinions — and many opinions are necessarily and contrarily opposed to the true opinion; but many expositions are not necessarily contrary to one

another, but are diverse in mode, while the expositions are nonetheless different from one another.

ARCHBISHOP OF KOLOSSI. That is enough; from the beginning I grasped the true meaning. I say again with reverence that your statement does not satisfy our statement, and is especially consistent with the words of my reverend lord. It is shown thus: when *theoroseon* — that is, *different* — is said, it is understood as contrary; in Greek it is said *etheran fides* — that is, contrary. But in the definition of the Third Council, *etheran fides* is said; therefore it is understood as contrary. And this is confirmed as follows: opinion and faith, according to the philosophers and theologians, are habits in our mind, differing with regard to their objects, according to Aristotle in the book of the *Posterior Analytics*. Hence just as *etheron* joined to *opinion* makes *different*, so joined to *faith* it makes *contrary* — and especially, as your reverend paternity says, since there is one right opinion. That is, when *etheron* — that is, *different* — is placed, it is understood as *contrary*. By this reasoning, since there is one faith, *etheron* of faith means contrary. Therefore in the prohibition of the Third Synod, *contrary* is meant.

CARDINAL. I have responded to your arguments, and since you have not responded to mine, I consider you to have conceded — for thus you imposed a law on me yesterday. And I therefore ask you, who are writing this down, to record it.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Most reverend lord, if the Archbishop of Kolossi had been silent, I would have responded to you — although even this would not have been sufficiently just, and I ought to have received responses to my questions. To things that do not come to the point of my question, I am not bound to respond.

CARDINAL. You have that law with me.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. I will speak.

CARDINAL. I hold you excused, for it is no wonder if you do not respond, since I would not know how to do so myself if I wished.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. The response that should have been given was prevented by the constraint of time; for when I made one argument, I received many responses, and I protested from the start — and my protest accomplished nothing.

CARDINAL. Let us omit the preambles — respond.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. You said many things; many responses are required.

CARDINAL. I am pleased.

ANDREAS. The Emperor said certain things in Greek.

CARDINAL. For God's sake, let us not waste time.

ANDREAS. Having heard these things, the Bishop of Ephesus rose and went before the Emperor; then, having returned to his place, the Emperor spoke as follows.

EMPEROR. The Bishop of Ephesus will begin to say what he had begun to say, since it does not appear necessary to respond to the things said by your paternity — for they were so lengthy that they have left his memory, and so he cannot respond. He will continue what he had begun, and if time permits, he will afterwards respond to what your paternity said; and if the hour does not permit, he will respond on another day.

Return to the Question of Charisius

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. I was responding to the few things said by your paternity. You said that Charisius gave you a great deal, and called his exposition a creed. I therefore ask: was the exposition of Charisius handed on to those who were converting as a universal creed, or was it admitted as a right profession of faith? For if some did not use it publicly, this means nothing to us; for we say that creed is prohibited universally which is recited in church and at baptism and at mass. We say that to make a particular and private exposition of someone's faith is in no way prohibited. What does

this have to do with our proposition, if the exposition of Charisius was admitted? He never handed it on as a universal creed, but only to show that his exposition was consonant with the Nicene.

CARDINAL. Charisius did not hand it on to those who were to be converted, nor as a common creed — and thus I respond to both points. And when you ask what this has to do with you, I say it has a great deal to do with you. We ask whether it is permitted to recite a creed in other words. And since it was not prohibited — it therefore bears on the proposition. And when you say that the text speaks of the creed which is sung in churches, the text does not say "*in church*" or "*privately*" — it makes no distinction whether it is said only in one place or privately. And I say that your paternity acts against the law, because you say something other than what is contained in the prohibition — therefore you say something other than what is contained in the law.

As to what is said about the common creed: I say that it is not true that the common creed is prohibited; the whole Church approved and subscribed to it, and that is the common one — therefore there is no prohibition. And the synod itself at the end of the fourth session made a creed and it was commonly approved; it is neither the Nicene nor the Constantinopolitan, nor the creed of Tarasius, and no one asserted that it acted wrongly. If you doubt whether it is at the end of the fourth session, I will show it. From these things it appears that what is common is not prohibited.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. This is found as your paternity said; hence it may be that that profession of Tarasius was approved as a common creed. And if another creed is found at the end of the fourth session besides those which were in the preceding councils, we will be silent. But it is true that that profession of Tarasius was approved just as the profession of Charisius and that of Agathon — as a private profession, not as a common creed. For no one was baptized under those creeds of which you make mention, nor were they sung in church, but were silent.

CARDINAL. You say that if I prove what I said, you wish to be silent. I prove it **first**: we have from the letter of Adrian that the profession of faith of Tarasius is a creed.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We do not admit this unless we see it; we do not recognize the very word.

CARDINAL. I will show it. Tarasius was assumed to the patriarchate from the lay state; Adrian says — and in this the authority of the Roman Pontiff is evident — that *"unless we had seen the text of the creed of faith in your letter, and unless we had seen your orthodox faith rightly held concerning holy images in your letters of the sacred creed according to the rite of the councils — and had we not seen your writings — as much as our heart was saddened by your illicit ordination, so much has our soul rejoiced at the confession of your faith."* Further below: *"We find in your letter the confession of the holy creed."*

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. It does not say there the *creed of Tarasius*; certainly it says there that it *contains* the creed.

CARDINAL. I say that in the letter he inserted the creed of his faith. We have it that the profession of Tarasius is a creed. **Second**, I say that the synod received this profession; therefore that profession, received by all, becomes common — therefore it is a common creed.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. This is a fallacy. We say that the profession of Tarasius was approved as private, and this is clearer than the sun. For even the letter of Cyril was admitted at the Third Synod, and that of Agathon at the Sixth — which contain a profession — but not as common creeds.

CARDINAL. No one says that Cyril made a creed, and no one calls the letter of Cyril a creed, as others are called. Hence there is reason for the difference. But rather, the profession of faith of Cyril, before being approved by the synod, was that of a private person; embraced by the synod, it became common, and all are bound to hold it from the moment the Church admitted it. And whoever would think the contrary is a heretic. For a private

profession becomes common by common approval. So likewise a private creed, commonly approved, becomes common. And this is proved by the letter of Agathon, who directs that his profession be given to those converting to the faith. Therefore it appears that the Church is not prohibited from making a creed.

But perhaps what moves you is that according to this there would be several creeds in the Church. I say that this is not absurd, because it has the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, and the Constantinopolitan; and because these differ only in words, they are considered one. As to what is said about it being fitting to say the common creed at baptism — I say this is not of the substance, but it suffices that one be baptized in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; a creed is not necessary.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Does Agathon in his letter hold that his faith ought to be handed on to those converting to the faith?

CARDINAL. Yes.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We have the saying of the fathers that whoever gives another creed than that given by the universal Church shall be anathema.

CARDINAL. These are the words of the letter: *"To the synod, etc. But to those who shall wish to be converted to the truth."* And it says that this shall be immutable and preached to all; and that one wishing to hold another faith shall be counted as hostile to the faith and liable to manifest condemnation. And whoever shall have confessed these things is regarded as in our communion and in agreement with the apostolic faith, and shall be co-priests and co-ministers of the faith. *"And to those who shall wish to be converted to the truth of the faith, let this profession of our faith be put forward with simplicity of heart."* He wishes it to be common; and those who do not hold it are condemned. And this was confirmed by the council. And yet we do not profess it in the same words, nor do we incur the penalties — since we are in agreement in the faith, because a diversity of words does not constitute another faith. Indeed, what is said as *"other"* must be

understood from its meaning. This is proved from two sessions of the Seventh Synod: because Theodore with his entire patriarchate made one profession; Tarasius another. The synod was asked whether they were catholic. A notable word was said: that these two professions are one and the same, and there is no diversity in them but perfect identity — and yet they differ in words. Diversity of words does not necessarily include diversity of things, because one thing can be named by several words.

As to what you say — that whoever gives another faith than the creed shall be anathema — it would follow that one baptized without a creed would be anathema, which is not true. Nor should you say thus; hence the word "*other*" is understood as *false* — as is said of the Nestorians, to whom a "*creed of perfidy*" was given. And it is understood of a corrupted creed outside the meaning of piety and faith, as I proved through the letter of the synod. Likewise it must be understood of a heretical creed or one corrupting the definitions of the fathers, as is proved in the Sixth Synod.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. What was said by your paternity about Agathon is not deduced from him; rather Agathon says what even if he had not said we ought to say. For what has been received by the holy fathers we must admit. Whoever would not admit such professions would be reasonably condemned to eternal punishment, as Agathon says. But on account of this we ought not to receive them as creeds nor call them creeds; for according to this there would be various creeds in the Church. Nor did Agathon himself say of himself that his profession ought to be handed on to those who are being baptized. But he said that his entire profession ought to be given to all as true, as particular and private.

No one was ever baptized under that creed, never was it read in church at the time of the sacred Mass. But you must show this: that the profession of Agathon was read in church. We ask whether the creed of Agathon was ever handed on to those being baptized or read in church. It is obvious that to all who are baptized a creed is read, and this is not to be denied; I do not know whether you do it otherwise. The creed of Agathon was never read as a common creed.

Final Exchange on Agatho's Letter

CARDINAL. You said that I had not proved from the letter of Agathon what I wished, and that Agathon does not call it a creed, and that it was not handed on to those being baptized nor ever read in churches, and that it is required at baptism that a creed be read, and that according to this there would be many creeds. As to the *i*: I deduced from the letter itself that it ought to be given to those converting to the faith.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. This does not lie in the letter.

CARDINAL. These are the words: *"To those wishing to be converted to the truth, we set forth the order of our faith with simplicity of heart and truth of words."* And that this profession shall be immutable and preached among all; and since it speaks of *"those wishing to be converted to the truth,"* it is understood of the truth of the faith, because it was speaking of that very thing.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. I showed that you have not proved this. Agathon says in the letter that to those wishing to be converted to the truth, his profession ought to be shown. And this — because at that time in the Eastern regions there were various sects, for many did not believe that there were two natures in Christ — he therefore made this clear.

CARDINAL. Agathon simply professes to all; therefore it has application to those who have converted, whether from Judaism or from paganism or from another, because he says that it shall be immutable and held by all, and that those not holding it incur condemnation. As to what you say — that it was not read in the Church of God — I say it was read both at the Western and the Eastern synod. And even if it had not been read, it suffices for me, so that it does not act against the prohibition. For the prohibition does not say: in church or elsewhere. Hence I ask: if someone were to recite another creed in the public square, would he sin, if it were false?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. He who sang it in the public square would not act against the prohibition.

CARDINAL. There I say the contrary.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. It has always been prohibited, even before this prohibition was issued.

CARDINAL. Would he who believed it within himself and did not sing it incur that penalty?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. He would incur it, because the definition is twofold and there are two penalties. **First**, it expressly prohibits mutating and ejecting from the creed the creed itself. Thus the holy synod determines: *"Let no one be permitted to write, hold, or teach another faith."* But all these things look toward the alteration of syllables and words. Then separately that definition condemns him who would hold the contrary. For it follows that if one were found to hold the dogmas of Nestorius, he would be condemned. Therefore the definition is twofold and sets forth a double condemnation: separately it prohibits the altering of the creed, and separately condemns those who would hold contrary views. If time permitted, the definition would be read.

CARDINAL. I know those things. Your paternity admits that wherever a false creed is put forward — whether publicly or privately — one falls under this constitution. From this I have that this law is understood universally, whether the utterance takes place in church or elsewhere.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. It is not stated simply, but doubly.

CARDINAL. It suffices for me that wherever it is said, one incurs the penalty.

Reading of the Definition

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. If the prohibitions are found separately, we ought to understand them separately. Let the definition be read.

CARDINAL. I am pleased — let the definition be read.

ANDREAS. The definition was read in these words; these having been recited:

CARDINAL. Note that it does not say "*with the creed read.*" Hence the prohibition looks to everything read — both definitions and the creed. Hence it looks to both definitions and all other things — because if it were prohibited to make another creed, it would be prohibited to make another definition, which is false.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. The creed and the definition are the same.

CARDINAL. On the contrary, they are different; this is manifestly evident from the fact that the councils made definitions, not creeds.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Did they not follow the first creed and anathematize those who dared another creed? And does not Pope Vigilius of Rome say this expressly in the letter to Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople? Let it be read.

CARDINAL. Since this prohibition concerns both the creed and the definition; and since other prohibitions have been made different in words; and since you ask why various prohibitions were made but not various creeds — I say that there was no necessity of accumulating creeds as there was with definitions, and it seemed that the first creed sufficed. And it does not follow: they did not do it, therefore they could not have done it.

Then I proved that other creeds were made, such as that of Tarasius and that of the fourth session. And I say: in the fourth of Chalcedon and the fifth, no creed was made, and many saw that the errors of those times could be settled by definitions. But the Roman Church, seeing that the error concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit could not be calmed except by frequent singing, therefore caused that word to be placed in the creed. And certainly the word *Theotokos* could have been added by the Fourth Council; otherwise it would follow that one council could bind other councils, and we could bind those following — which is against all natural and political reason, that in positive matters one council can impose a law on another.

As to what you say about definitions, I read first: it prohibits the putting forward of another faith than that in Nicaea — and thus it also has application to future councils, that they cannot change the faith. **Second**, it imposes that it be given to those converting from Judaism and from paganism.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Let it be read.

ANDREAS. These words were read: *"With these having been read, the holy synod determined: that it is permitted to no one to put forward or write or compose another faith besides that defined at Nicaea by the fathers there assembled. Those who dared to compose another faith, or to give it to those wishing to convert — whether from paganism or from Judaism or from another — if they are bishops, are to be deprived of the episcopal rank; clerics of the clerical rank; laypeople shall be anathematized."* Then it read as follows: *"If any others — whether bishops, clerics, or laypeople — should be found holding or teaching otherwise than in the exposition put forward by Tarasius concerning the humanity of the only-begotten Son of God — they shall be subject to the sentence of this holy synod. And a bishop shall be deprived of his episcopate, a cleric of his clerical rank, and we wish a layman to be excommunicated."*

CARDINAL. Hence according to the true understanding, a false faith is prohibited — both privately and publicly, and both for private persons; but a true faith is prohibited neither in public nor in private, nor universally nor in particular. As to what is said — that another faith must not be given to those wishing to convert — this must necessarily be understood of a contrary faith, for two reasons. **First:** as Hilary says, *"the understanding of words is taken not from the words but from the cause"* — for which reason the synod added this prohibition, because a certain James, disciple of Nestorius, had handed on a perverse faith; and on account of this cause the prohibition was added.

Second: because a great inconvenience would follow, according to your understanding — because a heretic would be punished by the same

penalty as a catholic, if a catholic were to add one word. This seems absurd, that the same penalty should apply to catholics as to heretics.

Third: does not the Council of Chalcedon say that those incur the penalty who corrupt the sentences of the fathers — not those who expound — and that those corrupt the Council of Chalcedon?

Final Exchange: On Declarations by the Fathers

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. When the fathers found that the faith was being expounded by the emperors, they did not admit it — indeed the fathers cried out: let no one make any exposition, nor let any be received except as the fathers of Nicaea made it. They held that faith in such great reverence that they would not even admit a private exposition. And when someone wished to change the faith, they said: the faith of the fathers suffices; we cannot expound more.

At length the emperors — pressing for it — did so; yet even they did it with reverence in their expositions, and the creed of the fathers is found there as a foundation, to show that they were following it in words and in meaning — then the deduction and their dogmas. And when they were accused of having admitted the letter of Leo, they responded that the emperor had not admitted an exposition of the faith, but a letter as declaring it. This is not prohibited — that outside the text the truth be declared, so that heretics may be put to shame. If they were to remain quiet, opportune declarations would not be needed, but the creed would suffice. On account of the audacity of heretics, it is expedient that they receive the declarations that have been made by the holy fathers. Thus the Third Council admitted the letter of Cyril — not so that it would become a common creed, but as declaring. This the synod says, crying out to the Emperor.

CARDINAL. I respond: you wished to read everything and have not emptied out my argument from the declaration of the Council of Chalcedon, through which it is declared how this word is understood — for the question

stands that the prohibition is referred to those corrupting the faith and not to those declaring it.

Since you ground yourselves on the cry of those who were for the Emperor, ground yourselves rather on another cry — because when the representatives of the Emperor asked that a declaration be made, the synod said: let *Theotokos* be added to the creed, saying these words: "*This is the faith of the fathers, the definition has pleased God, this is the faith of the orthodox, the faith suffers no fraud; let holy Mary Theotokos be written in the creed.*" The whole synod said this; therefore it was not prohibited to do this, because it would not have been requested had that been so.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Those were Egyptians.

CARDINAL. All except the Romans presiding for the Pope and some others; hence the greater part wished it.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Why then was this not added?

CARDINAL. Because there had been no doubt about it. It had been decided before that Mary was Theotokos. But then there was doubt whether Christ was in two natures — this they wished to be declared. And if it were asked why it was not requested, the Roman bishops were crying out that no other exposition be made — and yet it was made, because those better advised gave their assent to the will of those presiding for the Pope and the Emperor. Therefore declarations have always been made, and it is always permitted for the Church to make them.

Nor was it well said that they made them as though compelled — since those who defer little to the Council of Chalcedon say that the fathers allowed themselves to be compelled. And certainly that would not have been as much in favor of the council as the Second Council of Ephesus was not accepted, where the violence and compulsion of Dioscorus was present. Moreover the text says: "*We assent to your just persuasion.*"

As to what is said — that Cyril and Agathon did not expound — I have expressly that Cyril did expound the faith. These are the words: "*What the*

Nicene faith contains briefly, Cyril expounded more fully." And Leo expounded. It is said thus: *"The words of the most blessed Pope Leo, which expound the faith against the errors of Eutyches"* — and it says that because of error it is permitted to expound. And not only of Leo, but also of Flavian, when it is said thus: *"The martyr Flavian expounded the faith well."*

ANDREAS. With these words, an end was given to the proceedings, and we rose most willingly, the hour now being late.

ACTUS UNDECIMUS — 8 December

Continuation from the Previous Session

...having been passed over; and continuing, we will say what we then could not and passed over, lest we appear to have had nothing to respond — by abusing the very manner and force of disputation — to what was said. We say that the very word of the creed, together with the words and sounds that lie therein, compels us to understand the faith not only according to the understanding or meaning, but also with regard to the letters.

For every creed is a certain collation or composition through which we transmit our concepts to another — that is, names are signs or symbols of concepts, which belong to the mind, and it is necessary for all to use the same names that also communicate with the understandings. And so among all Greeks a rational animal is called *anthropos*; and in the same way among all Latins the same animal is called *homo*. For otherwise they could never communicate in concepts and understandings unless they used the same words and judgments. So likewise among all Christians the same creed must be held not only in understanding, but in words — so that in concepts and in words they appear to communicate the same thing.

Likewise, a creed — or the sound of a trumpet in heaven — are as trumpets for war; and where the sound of the trumpet is heard in one and the same battle, therefore among all Christians who have taken up war against heretics, one and the same creed of faith must be held and sung, and they must have the same creed as a sign and indication of the war

undertaken against unbelievers, so that the same creed be spoken in voice and word.

The syllogism runs thus: An exposition of the faith is a creed — this is the minor. Every creed must be one and the same among those who use it — this is the major. Therefore an exposition of faith, which is called a creed, must be one and the same among all Christians. Does it seem to you that any of our propositions is unsound? The conclusion appears necessary, unless someone wishes to resist the truth.

The same creed of faith — if we take it by way of definition — is nothing other than an exposition of faith which is understood through the voices and declarations contained therein. Does not this definition please you? I believe it ought to please everyone. Again I say: the creed of faith is an exposition of faith which consists in words and voices. Another creed, which the fathers would prohibit — and those who dared to make another are bound by anathema — is nothing other than another exposition of faith consisting in other voices and words. This exposition the fathers prohibit — and not only the contrary one, as you say.

Likewise, to put forward and to write and to compose the addition to the creed itself clearly refers to words and letters. Therefore also according to the word it is established that the creed remains; let these things be said from the words.

The Intention of the Prohibiting Fathers

But that your exposition is contrary to the intention of the prohibiting fathers would be shown if we wish to consider the intention of those fathers who prohibited — not from other acts which they performed for other purposes, nor from what was said first, nor from letters; for in each of these they had their own particular intention, even though every intention of the universal synod tended to that end, as blessed Cyril said and as you yourselves say — namely, that the opinion of Nestorius and those who held it be destroyed.

The understanding of the prohibition must therefore be sought from those things which were done concerning the prohibition and definition itself, and moreover from those letters that were written afterwards — in which the intention of the prohibition is contained more broadly — since through the letters the fathers wished to declare the intent of the prohibition.

It is established from what was done at that time that a transformed creed was brought before the council by Charisius through the Nestorians.

Therefore, when the fathers saw that unless they prohibited — through a universal and general prohibition — the taking away of the license to transform other creeds, it would be permitted to all heretics always — having the license to transform the creed — to insert many corruptions; therefore they determined that henceforth it shall not be permitted to hand on another faith to those converting from heresy — that is, another creed.

This is what Cyril says — he who was the legislator of this definition and who expounded it in his letter. Therefore to understand "*another creed*" as meaning "*contrary*" is ridiculous; for in that way many and various creeds would have been produced, since the fathers and councils through various times declared things concerning arising errors in matters of faith. But...

ACTUS UNDECIMUS — 8 DECEMBER

On the eighth of the aforesaid month, the Emperor began to bring forth these words in the assembly: Reverend father. Because yesterday, after we departed, I sent word to the most holy lord Pope that the method being followed does not please the deputies, and they are impeded and cannot say what they wish. For they say a few things and you repeat many, and our side cannot say what they wish. Therefore we have notified the most blessed lord Pope that this method be removed and that brief responses be made; and his holiness said that this pleased him and that it should be so ordered henceforth. Nevertheless it seemed to the deputies on our side that today they themselves should say whatever they wish. Let it not appear strange, nor that we act contrary to what has been set forth.

CARDINAL. Since I am the servant of the Emperor, I will speak frankly to your serenity. Your serenity says that your side is impeded; we have been patient and have never impeded them from speaking; and if something more was said that seemed expedient, it was said to declare the truth — because of necessity one who responds must say more than one who argues, since very many responses arise. And since you had asked that we proceed by brief questions and responses, and this had been conceded and mutually agreed upon, you now appear to vary this and to undo it. Let them speak, if it please, and perhaps we will respond just as briefly to what is proposed. But if they speak continuously, we will respond continuously before we leave here — for we do not wish you to depart without a response.

EMPEROR. I have always approved the method which I communicated to our lord; nevertheless, because of this, the intention of our side is to speak at greater length today.

CARDINAL. Speak as we have agreed, and we will respond word for word.

EMPEROR. Our side will speak continuously.

CARDINAL. We will respond; and speak for a measured time — speak for half an hour, and we for half an hour.

EMPEROR. We will speak as long as the business of speaking requires.

CARDINAL. It would be better if it were done word for word.

ANDREAS. The Bishop of Ephesus began in this manner.

Bishop of Ephesus: The Prohibition Concerns Words as Well as Meaning

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. In the preceding session, most honored fathers, we proposed to show that your response given to the prohibition is contrary to the intention of the fathers. Beginning therefore **first** from the very word "*other*" or "*different*" — in which the force of the present question resides —

we showed sufficiently and evidently that "*contrary*" can be said more than "*different*," and that there is no necessity for you to deviate from the word and understand only contrariety — as when you hear "*other*," to understand only "*contrary*," as you say.

Then from the arguments and words brought forward by the reverend lord Cardinal, as... it was necessary to yield. Now, if it please, let us return to...

...and the Third Council itself did not wish to insert into the creed the very word "*Mother of God*," which they had defined — which they defined. But they were in no way troubled that it should remain immutable; rather in a private definition they expressed what they had defined. These things must be taken from the very words of the definition.

Therefore the fathers **first** pressed upon the cause of that corruption or transformation of the creed of the true faith; **then** they condemned those who held those polluted opinions; **finally**, familiar words were applied fittingly to the matter. For to the exposition of the creed of faith there is applied that it is permitted to no one to put forward or write another faith. For these things manifestly look to the exposition of the creed, which takes place through words in matters of doctrine. Similarly, they prohibit that no one hold other dogmas. Let the definition itself be read — but it was sufficiently read in the preceding session.

Do you see from what was read how those fathers **first** wished to prohibit the transformation through words, and **then** also the meaning of private opinions? Separately is prohibited the transformation with regard to words, and separately, that no one hold anything else.

CARDINAL. In which prohibition is it prohibited?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. In the definition of the Third Council.

CARDINAL. I am content.

Cyril's Letter on the Immutability of the Creed

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. And since they lie thus distinctly, we ought not to mix them — as the letter attests. For in that letter written to John of Antioch, Cyril says: *"By no means do we permit the faith determined by the fathers to be moved"* — that is, the creed. Do you hear that saying — that the faith must not be moved in any way, not through the words, he says, nor through the meaning? For one mode of movement is the alteration of words. For that is moved which is changed — not only through meaning, but also on account of certain additions or diminutions. *"Nor do we permit ourselves or others who come after."* Do you hear how he excepts himself from the power of altering it, and others as well who might? For he speaks on behalf of the whole council, when he looks to that definition. Could anyone here say that only a contrary faith is prohibited? Do those heretics say *"nor to ourselves,"* when he says: *"neither to ourselves?"* This he neither says nor means. He continues, saying: *"We do not permit ourselves nor others to alter anything, nor to go beyond a syllable."* Do you see how he required diligence even down to words and syllables? And you see how this authority gives assent to our arguments — it is manifest. Can a single syllable introduce some heresy, when he says: *"not even a syllable?"* What follows confirms our opinion in all things — and according to the words, the creed remains immutable and unshaken. For it would have been beside the point for him to say: *"we do not permit ourselves a contrary faith"* — and this would have been manifestly repugnant to their own intention.

Likewise, after the union of the Orientals, certain ones complained about that council and about blessed Cyril, because he had received the Orientals who had admitted another creed than the Nicene. But he responded in excuse in the letter to Acacius, saying thus.

CARDINAL. How does it begin?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. *"A matter indeed worthy of knowledge"* — elsewhere: *"the cause indeed chose what is worthy"* — *"I perceive, however, that they say this."*

CARDINAL. Read from a little higher up there — do not sow among thorns; read.

ANDREAS. It was read with these words: *"I perceive that they also say this — in the exposition of the creed, perhaps because we dishonored that ancient one; 'a fool speaks foolish things,' and his conscience understands empty things. But we say this: not in the exposition of the faith — for those who either asked anything from us in the exposition of the faith, or we received another. The inspired Scripture of God suffices for us, along with the sobriety of the fathers, and also that one rightly ordered, polished symbol of the faith. Since however..."*

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. What follows in that very letter declares why the fathers admitted the exposition of faith of the Orientals — but as private, not as public. And therefore we pass over this.

CARDINAL. And I will supply it.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Then it is added: *"For the holy and ecumenical synod at Ephesus has necessarily provided that no other exposition of the faith should be introduced into the Churches of God beyond the existing ones, which the fathers speaking in the Holy Spirit determined."* The rest that follows in the letter, we believe to be known to your paternity; therefore, so as not to waste time, we have passed it over.

From these things it appears that they most vehemently reprov'd the wish to alter the creed beyond what had been declared. For they thought that the profession of faith of the Orientals had been accepted as a creed; and because blessed Cyril excused them, saying it was not accepted as contrary, but because it was not accepted as an exposition of faith or a creed, but as a profession of their own opinion.

Again in another letter to the same John of Antioch, blessed Cyril writes, and putting together the words of that very letter in the proper letter, he says such things.

CARDINAL. How does it begin?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. *"Let them rejoice..."*

CARDINAL. You have cited the same letter elsewhere.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. These are the words of John, which were placed in the letter of Cyril, and these are literally: *"Concerning the Mother of God, how we hold this, and concerning the mode of the humanity of the only-begotten Son of God — not necessarily as part of an addition, but in the form of a full instruction, as we have received and handed on everything from the divine Scriptures and the tradition of the holy fathers, we will say very briefly, adding nothing nonetheless to the exposition of the faith by the holy Nicene fathers. For, as we said before, it is sufficient for every recognition of piety and the rejection of every perfidy."*

You have heard, reverend father, what has been said about the Mother of God, and concerning the mode of the incarnation of God — that we speak not as part of an addition. For he writes that addition in the creed is prohibited. Therefore he says: *"We make no addition in the creed."*

CARDINAL. He does not say *"creed."*

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. It suffices that he says *"faith"* — and he adds: *"adding nothing to the exposition of faith by the Nicene fathers."* They did this because they did not add in the creed. Do you see how deeds agree with words and words with deeds, and everything attests to our intention?

Thus the intention of the definition is clearly evident both from the words of the fathers and from what was given by them — the definition means nothing other than that the creed remain immutable, and that with regard to additions no one who wishes may transform the creed and introduce heretical opinions into it. They commanded that this definition shall be valid and endure perpetually with dreadful penalties — which definition they made as a rule of the catholic faith, since they recognized that from this no harm could be inflicted on anyone. But on the contrary, from the license to add and to alter, there could sometimes be some corruption both of meaning and of words.

But if they had prohibited only what was contrary, as you say, it would have been superfluous; for such a thing was already prohibited before. That

does not make a prohibition that prohibits what is already prohibited. Likewise, otherwise the penalties would by no means be in vain against those who would set forth a contrary faith. No one ever sets forth his faith as false — even if it were truly contrary to the right faith — but believing that his faith is true and sound and consonant with the Holy Scriptures. Hence they would say it is permitted to them to alter the creed; for all would express their own true faith, and the definition would be superfluous — and truly and indeed it would be superfluous and empty for one who would dare say such things.

Likewise, whoever would present a contrary faith he would bind not only with deprivation of his episcopate, if he were a bishop, but also with anathema — which is made most clear especially through the Third Council itself. For it both anathematized Nestorius and not only deprived him of his episcopate. And in the definition it is stated that a bishop must be deprived of his episcopate if he is found to hold another faith — the definition looks only to the alteration according to the word of faith, not to the alteration according to meaning... it punishes bishops with deposition, and it delivers laypeople to anathema.

CARDINAL. Say that again.

ANDREAS. They repeated the same things again.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Again, to wish to determine things that appear evident to nearly all seems unnecessary — indeed, insane. But that a contrary faith is prohibited appears to everyone, even if someone might feel some humanity about it. And blessed Cyril says: the council has necessarily provided for this, and it is not just to understand this... which appear to everyone — namely concerning a contrary faith and addition, but concerning every addition.

Likewise, when something was the cause that something came about, it can also be said that this same thing produces that — even if it does not principally do so. But the ability to add true things can be a cause that false things also be added. And since he who holds a faith does not believe it to

be false — but this is indeed to move the faith — therefore we can say that he who adds is a cause of the mutation of faith, even if he adds true things. For since this is permitted, it could sometimes be permitted to some to insert also false things among true ones, when these seemed true. This we can perceive from the things themselves: many creeds were held before the prohibition itself, as is indicated through the histories of the Church. Therefore it can be said that he too changes the faith who simply adds — and not only he who adds false things, as you say.

Likewise, blessed John the theologian and evangelist appears to have wished his Apocalypse to remain untouched even down to the alteration of words, and he curses those who would dare such things: *"If anyone shall have added" — saying — "to this book, God shall add upon him the plagues written in this book; and if anyone shall have subtracted, God shall subtract him from the book of the living."* If such things — which present such horrible curses — are to be understood of words and syllables, why shall we not understand the same in the creed, where Cyril and Agathon prohibit — one does not permit another word to be altered or a syllable to be transgressed; the other, wishing it to be preserved entirely according to meanings, says so?

Likewise, the holy Gospel, the blessed Apostle, and all Scripture were expounded and declared by many holy fathers; and the fathers of the First Council proclaimed the Son consubstantial with the Father, taking the occasion from the Holy Scriptures. Likewise the Second Council proclaimed the Holy Spirit and life-giver. Nonetheless, none of them wished to add any of these things to the Gospel — as if it were permitted to add declarations to the principal texts, they ought to have been added there as well. But if no Christian dares this, why should not the same reverence be shown to the creed — especially where the prohibitions of the fathers have specifically prohibited it?

But to accommodate you, I will incorporate into your argument what I take from the Holy Scriptures, and it will not be alien to what must be said; indeed it is most pertinent to our disputation. I ask that you receive this word patiently.

The Argument of Gregory the Theologian on the Holy Spirit

Those who were attacking the Holy Spirit at the time of Gregory the Theologian asked of the orthodox and used this division: *"Is the Holy Spirit begotten, or unbegotten?"* And when those orthodox did not say *"begotten"* nor *"unbegotten,"* they inferred: *"Therefore, if the Holy Spirit is neither begotten nor unbegotten, it remains that the Holy Spirit is a creature."*

And the great Gregory — surnamed the Theologian — to meet this, spoke thus: *"Where will you place what is said: 'who proceeds from the Father,' when it rises up in the middle of your division; and what is introduced by the better theologian — that is, our Savior the Lord Christ — unless you were to extract that word from the holy Gospels, it would appear that a third testament of the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father is being made?"*

Do you hear how he who subtracts such a word from the Gospels establishes a third testament? For he alters it into a testament. Therefore he who adds *filioque* in this truth makes a third testament. Or do you think that only he who subtracts makes a third testament, but not he who adds? Much more must this be said of him who adds — for to make a third testament is beyond all presumption.

There are two testaments according to the Apostle. But if someone dares not to add *filioque* to the Gospel, he will add it to the creed. Will he not then also make a third creed? And truly, whoever of the Christians hears of a third creed will not admit it: there are two creeds as there are two testaments — one of the First Council, implicit, and another of the Second Council, made explicit.

CARDINAL. Have you reached the end of what you wished to say?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We have many things to say, but since time does not permit, it seems they must be passed over. For what we have to say in response to the other arguments, we will say in our other sessions.

Therefore, if it please, let us conclude the speech. And if it please your reverend paternity to respond, choose two points and respond to those.

CARDINAL. Hear me.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. As we are weary in speaking, so in listening.

Cardinal's Response

CARDINAL. Your paternities have the advantage in dealing with us: if in writing, in writing; if by mouth, by mouth; if at length, at length; if briefly, briefly. Since you have chosen the way of speaking at length, bear with me to speak at length. **First** of all, keep in mind that I have given twenty-seven arguments and you have responded to none, but have entered upon other matters. And we respond to those well and clearly — since we are here for the declaration of truth, we must manifestly set forth on both sides whatever we find bearing on the truth.

And yesterday I solemnly said one thing; now I will say another. I sent to Verona and there came a decree of the Roman Pontiffs, most authentic; and truly looking for something else, I found this unexpectedly. Here are the letters which Athanasius writes to Pope Mark and Liberius and...

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We have never heard of Mark.

CARDINAL. He was the immediate successor of blessed Sylvester.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We have Julius.

CARDINAL. It is not so. All the Egyptians, because they had been despoiled by heretics and because the books and the canons of the Nicene Council had been burned, wrote to blessed Athanasius — principally writing to blessed Mark — to send them the canons of the Nicene Council, because Athanasius says: *"I was present when at the Nicene Council those canons were given to your representatives."*

Pope Mark says that he had them searched for in the archive of the Roman Church and that he found them whole and unharmed; but because they had been subscribed by the bishops of the Nicene Synod, he does not wish to send the originals, but authentic copies made afterwards. Athanasius

asks Pope Liberius to give him help. Among other things Liberius responds and urges patience and endurance in persecutions, and says some things pertaining to the Nicene Council. Then he says that among the definitions of the Nicene Council there was this definition: that it is permitted to no one to put forward another faith than those which were put forward at that council. And these are the words: *"Therefore, as we read, the aforesaid holy council defined that no one is permitted to put forward or write or propose or hold or teach another faith, nor to feel or put forward anything in the faith that could be contrary to the rules of the fathers. But whoever shall have presumed to compose another faith or to put it forward or to teach it, or to hand over another creed to those desiring to be converted to the way of truth from any heresy — whether Jews or pagans wishing to become Christians — if they are bishops, they shall be made strangers to their episcopate; clerics to the clergy; if they are monks or laypeople, they shall be struck by anathema."*

From these things I conclude that Liberius had seen those canons in the archives of the Roman Church. Liberius was the third from Sylvester: **first** Mark, **second** Julius, **third** Liberius. And Liberius was before the Council of Constantinople — because the Council of Constantinople was held at the time of Damasus. After Liberius came Felix, then Damasus.

From these things it appears that the prohibition against this alteration being made was made at the First Council — although it was then repeated at the Third. You have repeatedly said that the Constantinopolitan Creed could be made because it was before the prohibition. Hence you say that the universal Church after the prohibition of the Third Council could not add anything even true. If this were true, the bishops of Constantinople ought to be deposed and the laypeople excommunicated — because, with the prohibition standing as it was made at the time of the First Council, both you admit and it is most clear that the Constantinopolitan fathers added, yet true things. Therefore it follows that, if adding even true things incurred penalties, the Constantinopolitan fathers were excommunicated. But it is sacrilege to say this; therefore it is necessary to understand *"another faith"* as meaning contrary. Indeed, the prohibition of the Nicene Council contains

this more than the prohibition of the Third Council — because the Nicene prohibition prohibits adding to the creed, whereas in the prohibition of the Third Council it is prohibited to alter it.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. This, though it is not in the prohibition of the Third, is declared in the Fourth.

CARDINAL. Strip your consciences bare and see if you can respond to this. Say briefly the response to this.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. We will respond after we have searched to see whether that letter is among us. For the present we say this: the intention of the fathers who convened at Nicaea ought rightly not to be judged from that letter alone, but from the acts and definitions of those fathers themselves. We will require this — that you show the words either in the canons or in the acts of the First Council. Otherwise, in what way shall we receive things found written elsewhere and not in the definitions of those very fathers, whose definition is the matter at hand? For in another way it does not at all seem credible that those fathers defined this from their own definition — this is attested by the works themselves. For in the subsequent councils that were held from the time of the First Council until the time of the Sixth, many expositions were made; and, I believe, also in the Council of Antioch an exposition was made — a council which we receive as orthodox and whose canons we approve. Also, that council says it admits that definition as pious and faithful — namely, so many councils would not therefore have transgressed that prohibition.

CARDINAL. You certainly do not grasp this correctly. I say that from these words it is concluded that there was not here the meaning you believe in the prohibition — namely concerning the elucidation of true doctrine. And from what you say — with the prohibition standing as it was — it is concluded that the prohibition does not encompass the expression of truth.

On the Credibility of the Source

And as to whether this book is to be believed — look at it. This book is ancient; let it be examined. And if we believe one great doctor, how much more ought we to believe one Supreme Pontiff — especially at that time when there was no controversy, since Liberius was before the Council of Constantinople. From this you can understand what the words of Celestine import — who was before the Third Synod, and who says: who escapes anathema who adds anything? Hence Celestine holds that before the Third Council there was a prohibition; otherwise he would not say those words: *"who is not worthy of anathema."*

Likewise, the Council of Chalcedon appears to have thought this in the address it makes to the Emperor Marcian, where it says that some were asserting — arguing against Leo — that it was permitted to no one to expound the faith beyond the fathers who were at Nicaea. Now that I have proved sufficiently that the prohibition existed before the Third Council, and that those words *"another faith"* must be understood as *"different"* — as I believe you hold this in your own souls — let us come to the response to what was set forth by you.

NICENUS. Since your lordship appears to have made mention that Mark did not wish to send the originals — are the canons contained in that letter?

CARDINAL. In the letter he says he is sending all of them; it was not fitting to make particular mention of them.

NICENUS. I ask: does anyone else make mention of what you say?

CARDINAL. Yes. It was Liberius.

NICENUS. What was it fitting to write to Athanasius through Liberius, if those canons had been sent by his predecessor?

CARDINAL. The Pope did this by expressing the penalty; and you can look at the book and you will learn from what precedes and follows whether it was necessary. And I have proved through other authorities that this prohibition existed before, and you have not yet responded to anything. As to the *i* argument, you say it was proved that by those words *"another faith"*

is understood as addition of words and not as a different faith, and that "*contrary*" contains more than "*different*."

Final Arguments of the Cardinal

And I say thus: according to you it is to posit a true faith according to Nicaea, different for addition, and evil — since the one true faith is that which was expounded at Nicaea, which expounded the Gospel; it follows that every other is false — and this is most clear. If this alone is true, therefore others — even if different — are false; just as we say: only the God of the Christians is true, therefore the others are false.

As to what you say — that addition makes difference — I say it is not true, because things that agree in substance, even if they differ in words, do not cease to be the same; for one and the same thing can be named by different names and does not cease to be the same thing. This is proved through the first session of the Council of Chalcedon, where it is said that the fathers at Nicaea and the fathers who at Ephesus agreed and concurred with one another, so that they held or defined nothing different. And you say that in the words there is the greatest difference.

Likewise, when the two definitions of Theodore and Tarasius at the Seventh Council were read, it was said that nothing there was discordant from the faith — and yet in many words they were discordant. From which it is most clearly gathered that what is not said to be another faith nor to disagree in anything is that which agrees in meaning even if it disagrees in words — the contrary of which you have said in many words.

Likewise I allege the argument that the Constantinopolitan Creed — since it agrees in meaning with the Nicene — is considered the same; and you yourselves have said this repeatedly. And I proved that diversity of words does not induce diversity of the substance of the matter. Hence by force of the word "*another faith*" it must necessarily be understood as "*false*," since there is only one — and that one true, the other false.

Then I say that all difficulty is removed, because at the Council of Chalcedon it was declared that this word "*other*" is understood as "*different*."

As to what you said **second** about the exposition of the creed — that it is the exposition of any concept whatsoever, and that it is necessary that names participate with words, and that just as among the Greeks it is *anthropos* and among us *homo*, and that it must be one and the same among all Christians so that this signification be common to all Christians, so that all understand one and the same — I say that this definition of the creed is not perfect, because it would follow that every definition of the faith would be a creed — which you yourselves deny.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. That definition... [I did not give to that creed which is sung in church, but particular...]

CARDINAL. I proved through the creed of Charisius and of Tarasius that it is called a creed — other than the common one — and yet they have different words. As to what you say — that there must be one creed among all Christians so that it signify the same thing, as *homo* does — I say that this is so, and our creed has the Constantinopolitan and Nicene and the Gospel; and, as I said before, diversity is not considered in the words but in the signification. Hence, just as the Constantinopolitan and Nicene are considered the same, so ours differs in nothing.

As to what you say — that it must be similar to the voice of the trumpet and sound the same against heretics as a trumpet in battle — I say that even if among soldiers there is a sound that designates battle, if one trumpeter were to sound it more fully, he would not by that means depart from the battle, but would rather incite it further. It is certain: if there were a hundred trumpets, not all have the sound at the same pitch; but nonetheless they are regarded as one if they agree in the mode of the song — just as if there were one type of arms for fighting, even if one man polished his arms more brightly, he would not be seen to change the type of arms. So it is written of blessed Cyril, that he declared the Nicene faith more fully, and he does not appear to have held the contrary. And so we have done — for we have

declared the truth more fully, and therefore we do not appear to have done anything contrary. Hence, since we are in agreement with the Nicene and Constantinopolitan in the truth of the faith, it must be regarded as one and the same. And all Christians who know the truth, hearing our creed, understand the Nicene and Constantinopolitan — just as soldiers understand the sound for battle.

Then you make a syllogism. I say: if you wish to understand that every creed must be the same in signification, I concede; if you wish to say in words, I deny it — and I prove this through the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, and the Constantinopolitan.

As to the **ii**: if you wish to say that every exposition of faith is a creed, I deny this. And so you may understand: faith differs from a creed, because faith is one thing and a creed is another. But if you wish to say: namely, the Nicene Creed is the faith — I say yes, and that it must be one, I confess in reality. And yet you wish to say that it must be identical in words — I deny this. And I cite the letter of Cyril that begins "*They have prattled*" ("*Obgarruerunt*"); there Cyril says that we must join our understandings in the irreproachable meanings of the holy fathers. Then he says certain words about the creed — namely, "*And was incarnate by the Holy Spirit from the Virgin Mary*" — and then he here speaks the words of one understanding what "*And was incarnate*" means. Hence Cyril was attending to the signification of the words, not to the sound of the words; he says the words and dogmas are to be understood as to what they signify.

Then you say that that prohibition must be declared from what was done there in that session — not from what was done before and after, and that it ought not to be proved through subsequent letters. You say this does not appear to have reason with anyone who understands. On the contrary: what precedes declares laws more than anything else, because the understanding of words must be taken from the cause of speaking, not from the words themselves. Hence more attention must be paid to the cause of the legislator than to the very words of the law — as blessed Hilary says. Hence from the preceding acts and letters I proved this meaning which I stated. Nonetheless from the subsequent letters

afterwards I also proved — namely that the entire intention of the council was to condemn the dogma of Nestorius. And it is proved through two letters which say that that definition speaks of those who are outside the meaning of charity and right faith. Hence from what was done then and before and after, I proved that it must be so understood and that it cannot be understood otherwise.

Then you enter upon the point that from the session of the council it is also evident that the prohibition of words is present, because they were moved to repress the inconveniences that followed from the diversion of the creed that had been made. I say that from this session the entire contrary is deduced — because if that transformed creed had been true, the holy synod would have been content, since the intention of the synod was to do nothing other than follow the truth. And the text states the reason: because perfidy was contained in it. And the creed of Charisius was approved because it contained the truth. And so the intention of the synod was to prohibit falsehood.

As to what you say — that those words "*another faith*," that is "*another creed*" — this is repugnant to the signification of the words.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Cyril declared this.

CARDINAL. This word "*we do not permit*" — faith or creed — and I say that through the prohibition every false exposition is prohibited, whether it be a creed or any other dogma.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. It does not seem so.

CARDINAL. You do not use the civility with which I treat you; perhaps you do so because I press you too hard.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. You press the truth — and I do not wonder, for you are not expert in Greek.

CARDINAL. I cite Latin. I prove from the very signification itself. It is certain that faith — especially evangelical faith — contains explicitly more than the

creed does. A creed is a certain concise summary of what is from the Scriptures of the holy fathers; hence it is certain that the concise summary of a matter differs from the whole as the explicit from the implicit. Hence "*creed*" signifies something different from "*faith*." And I prove: see in the Sixth Council where it is said: "*But those who dare to hold or teach another faith, or to hand on another creed.*" The same in the Fourth Council: "*Those who hold another faith or hand on another creed.*" Hence these councils regard these as different things — and you will not deny this.

Then you cite the letter of Cyril where he responds to John, Patriarch of Antioch, and says that there it is prohibited to alter even a syllable — and you make us attentive. I will respond: since you argue from syllables and words, I will argue through the same in responses. At no time in that passage can anyone alter certain words — faith or creed or move a word, or on the contrary pass beyond syllables. I ask that we stand at words or syllables.

We do not move the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed; and although this word is placed in it, it is not moved — rather it is set down for the purpose of declaration. Hence since we do not move its substance and we honor it, it cannot be said that we have moved it — and so we have not altered a word. Let the Constantinopolitan Creed and ours be examined. We remove nothing from the Constantinopolitan. As for the passing beyond syllables — I say we pass beyond nothing, because all the syllables that are in the Constantinopolitan are in ours. Since therefore it says nothing about addition — why do you make an issue of added syllables? And this response would suffice amply.

But from the very text of the letter I wish to respond. Even if this word of addition had been prohibited — unless you consider the words of the letter and what precedes and follows, you will never be able to understand it well. Let us look at the antecedents. Cyril says that some were arguing against him, as though he said that Christ had brought flesh from heaven. **Second**, he was accused of having said that in Christ there had been a mixture or fermentation of natures. Blessed Cyril says: "*Far be it that I hold this; on the contrary, I say that I think those who say so are expressly against Holy*

Scripture and the holy fathers. I follow the great Athanasius in all things, from whom I greatly fear to deviate."

Hence since these opinions were imputed to Cyril and he himself says he follows him in all things — it follows that those words *"another faith"* are understood as *"false faith."* This also appears in the letter where he says: *"Our entire contest is that Mary be called the Mother of God."* But this word was not explicitly in the Nicene Creed, and he himself said this openly. Hence to add something beyond the Nicene Creed — provided it contain the truth — is not reproved.

Then, that Cyril asserts this appears from the reason which he subjoins: *"We remember Solomon saying: 'Do not transgress the boundaries which your fathers set.'"* But he himself, when he expounded his faith — to which the prohibition had applied — said: *"I am certain that I have not transgressed in any way the faith of the Nicene Synod."* The synod responded: *"You have certainly not transgressed, because you have followed the Nicene faith."* Therefore blessed Cyril demonstrates that one who states the right account of the faith does not transgress the boundaries of the fathers — and therefore does not act against the prohibition.

And this prohibition — *"do not transgress"* etc. — is referred to the creed just as to the other definitions of the preceding fathers, because he expressly says: *"We follow in all things the sentences of the fathers and especially of Athanasius."* Hence the transgression of the boundary applies to every transgression from the institution established by the fathers; but in no way is it prohibited to declare the doctrines of the fathers — therefore neither the doctrines of the Nicene Creed.

And, as I said elsewhere, this prohibition looks to the definitions just as to the creed; and just as it is clear that it is permitted to make other true definitions, so too true declarations of the creed — which the prohibition equally looks to.

Then, since blessed Cyril grounds himself in the authority of Solomon, this prohibition looked just as much to those standing at Nicaea as to those

present at other councils. Hence, if this prohibition binds those who add, it binds the Constantinopolitans who added many things.

Yesterday I proved through the Seventh Synod that this prohibition was made through Holy Scripture, when it says: "*cursed*" etc., adding that "*a great penalty binds those who add.*" Hence, if the Roman Church were subject to the prohibition, much more would the Constantinopolitan Synod be. But neither that synod nor we are subject to it — but rather those who hold the contrary.

Likewise, the understanding of the words of Cyril appears from what he was saying against Nestorius. Cyril said to Nestorius: "*It does not suffice that you say the creed, which you interpret badly, but that you confess these chapters which we send.*" If blessed Cyril had wished the words to be held, he would not have asked anything from Nestorius except that he profess those words — and this is what Nestorius wanted. But since syllables and words did not suffice for blessed Cyril, he wished him to profess the following chapters and the true meaning.

And that subtraction and addition are not to be understood of syllables but of signification appears from the letter of Celestine, where he reproves Nestorius — and also complains about him that he removed the point that the blessed Mary is the Mother of God.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. It is denied that he makes mention of the creed.

CARDINAL. These are the words: "*Who is not judged worthy of anathema, who adds to the faith? For the faith itself fully and manifestly handed on by the apostles has neither diminution*" — diminution is required — "*nor increase. Among the many things impiously preached by you, the universal Church refuses this from the creed handed on by the apostles: we lament that the words 'Mother of God, the blessed Mary' have been removed.*"

I say that Celestine says this — that these words were removed from the Apostles' Creed by Nestorius; and yet they were not there explicitly when he asks that they were subtracted.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. Which words?

CARDINAL. Because he said that Christ was of two natures and two persons, and that Mary was the mother of the animated body and not of the Word. Then blessed Celestine does not argue against the Nicene Council for having removed *"he descended into hell"* and certain other words. Therefore addition or subtraction is not understood except when from them there follows a subtraction of truth.

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. This book does not have this.

CARDINAL. Do you have the Apostles' Creed?

BISHOP OF EPHESUS. No; and if it had existed, a word would have been said about it.

CARDINAL. It does not follow — because no word is ever made about the Constantinopolitan Creed. And I say that even if he were speaking of the Nicene Creed, in that one this matter of the Mother of God is not present; and yet he complains that it is. And so Celestine looks to the meaning. And since you deny that there is an Apostles' Creed, I wish to show you. Blessed Pope Leo, writing to the Augusta Pulcheria in the letter that begins *"Quantum presidii"* (*"How great a defense"*), says: *"As that brief confession of faith of the apostles is sealed with so many sentences, as though instructed by heavenly guidance, so that the opinion of all heretics could be cut down by the sword of that creed alone — of whose creed's fullness, if Eutyches had wished to receive it with a pure and simple heart, he would not have deviated in any way from the dogma of the Nicene Council"* — and thus he says it was composed by the twelve apostles.

Beyond these things I say that the words of Cyril must be understood of additions that perverted the true meaning. I say to prove this that these words must be understood according to the law of the synod — it is not to be believed that Cyril understood anything other than what the synod understood. But it is clear that the Council of Chalcedon declared the definition to be understood of corruptions. Therefore so too the words of the council. And hear this exposition.

He who wishes to declare the definition made in the Council of Ephesus does two things: **first**, he declares the definition of the Council of Ephesus and why they made it; **second**, he sets forth the reason for these defined matters; then he declares the same. And it belongs to John Simaris — most celebrated among you — who says thus: *"With these read, the faithless Nestorius not only taught those dogmas, but held perverse views and blasphemed this creed produced by Charisius. They condemned that Nestorius and determined that what was done at Nicaea be held; but those who teach contrary things hold a diverse faith — namely those who teach and establish diverse dogmas. If a bishop"* etc.

EMPEROR. What exposition is this? This book is not approved.

ARCHBISHOP OF KOLOSSI. It is celebrated among you. How would you wish to disapprove of it in this matter? It suffices that your own Greek so declares it — and he is the secretary of the Emperor.

EMPEROR. He is not a doctor.

BISHOP OF FORLÌ. If it were for you, you would admit it readily; you must — willing or unwilling — hear the truth.

Final Citations and Conclusion

CARDINAL. Finally, he cites the letter of Cyril and endeavors to deduce that the mutation of faith is prohibited by these words: *"they have reproved us similarly, as one who had written long ago: holding contrary views, and that this was not discordant from the novelties of Nestorius."*

Cyril says that a fool speaks foolish things. *"I never said the contrary; on the contrary, I follow the exposition of the Nicene faith, destroying nothing of what has been established."* Hence he adds: *"We have never said such things, and we would not say anything against what the Council of Ephesus does."* Hence, when he speaks of *"another,"* he understands *"contrary."* This is clear from what precedes

the definition, because they understood it of the impious faith of Nestorius, when he spoke of "*another*."

INTERPRETER. I am exhausted.

ANDREAS. It was remarkable, given the multiplicity of the contests, that one could there relate so many mutual debates.

CARDINAL. Say a little, I beg — which is expressly against them. When they say he adds nothing, in fact he adds many things, as is apparent to anyone looking at the words that follow: "*we confess... perfect man...*" etc. — there are more than thirty words. And when he says, if this prohibition was made at the First Council as we say, it would not have been fitting to make it anew, I respond that a prohibition is often repeated for greater explication, because the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth also made it — and it was fitting to repeat it.

Then you say that the word "*to put forward*" is understood of the verbal, because if it were of the contrary, the heretics would thereby have been deprived, not only subjected to deprivation. I say that I wonder at your paternity — the response appears from the text. Are not bishops and clerics who hold the dogmas of Nestorius heretics? What is it that in the second part of the definition, those who hold the Nestorian dogmas are cast down from their episcopate and not anathematized? Hence from this text it appears that that penalty is imposed expressly on heretics. And I say it was not opportune for them to be anathematized, because by the law itself heretics are anathematized — since in the decrees of the council also every heretic is anathematized. This constitution wished to add this penalty.

As to what you say — that the first part speaks only of those altering words — you speak against the letter of Cyril beginning "*Love of doctrine*," and against the letter of Vigilius. I say that that synod passed sentence against the evil opinion of Nestorius. It is certain that the second part of the definition speaks of the Nestorian dogma. If the first part were not understood of heretical dogma, Cyril would not have said what was true, nor would Vigilius.

What he said about the prohibition of John — it does not follow that from new declarations something could not be declared. And I say it is true that nothing new

is to be added — but there have been added and will be added until the end of the age declarations of Holy Scripture and of the Gospels of God.

As to what you say about the third testament: we say that we do not make a third testament — but as Cyril declared, so we too have given an understanding of the creed.

And when they say that only two creeds are found, we prove that there is found the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, and the Constantinopolitan. Likewise that of Tarasius according to Adrian — who adds "*through the Son*" — and it was not considered to act against the prohibition of the Third Council. And the Seventh Synod made one, as appears at the end of the fourth session. By these things all your objections have been answered; and were it not for the constraint of time, I would prove it with many other arguments. And I do not doubt that you are clear about this — but that you wish to probe how we defend the truth itself.

ANDREAS. It was the twenty-third hour of the day and the cold was greatest; and each man — wearied by cold or hunger — rose willingly, and the session of that day was dissolved.

ACTUS XIII — THIRTEENTH OF DECEMBER

In this assembly, the Ephesian began in the following manner.

EPHESIAN. We promised your reverend paternity to respond specifically to the things that were said on your part, which are contained in eight chapters. We chose these eight chapters from among the others because they seemed to us more necessary and pertinent, and because they would not have superfluity and would pertain to the matter. But while, after the manner of dialecticians, we believe we are responding to these chapters, we do not know by what arrangement we have run off to certain other things, so that we were scarcely able to set forth the first argument, and we clearly and evidently showed that Charisius did not present the creed as a common one, but as an exposition of his faith, by which he wished to show himself to be faithful and to hold orthodox truth. We have no concern about a private creed, but about the universal church at present. If it seems good, let me

repeat what we left aside, and let us proceed through the remaining chapters in order, as shall be possible for us, examining each one.

On the prohibition against professing a different faith, and the meaning of "to think": Therefore, the second of the said articles was this: that the prohibited definition forbade not only that anyone could put forward another faith, but also think it. And from this it was sufficiently clear that the prohibition does not extend itself only to the utterance of words, but to the conception of the mind, since we think many things that are not expressly in the creed. If we were to hand this argument over to an examiner, it would be found rather to work for us than against us. The word "to think" (*sapere*) in the definition of the third council is not counted among the other terms. The other words indeed lie separately by themselves in the prohibition — namely: to profess, to compose, or to say. It is evident that these terms look toward the exposition which is according to the wordings. Afterward it follows: "if any were found to think what was set forth by Charisius, that is, the wicked dogmas of Nestorius, they would be subject to the sentence of the holy ecumenical council." This therefore is clear: that these words look toward the sense and intention of the mind. For someone can err, while the wording remains safe and intact, around the sense and intention — which Eutyches suffered at the fourth council. For while he seemed to himself to hold the Nicene creed and to remain and persevere in the same faith, he both thought and taught things alien to the true and sound faith. Hence those fathers of the fourth council, after they had expounded the same wordings, said: "let the creed remain immutable." They subsequently added: "to teach or to think otherwise," since those terms — namely to profess, to write down, or to teach — look only to the wordings of the creed, while "to think" and "to teach" look to the sense; and this, lest anyone, while professing the wordings of the creed, as Eutyches did, think otherwise — namely that he use a different intention, sense, and doctrine apart from the right faith. It is no wonder if the word "to think" is understood differently from the other terms; for it is immediately distinguished by the force of the copulative conjunction and the force of the conclusion and the addition of the word "otherwise." But since the creed is twofold — that is, according to sense and according to wording — one of the prohibitions tends toward intention, the other toward wording; "to profess" refers to the creed, "to think" and "to teach" refer to the intention of the faith. For it would be pointless to say "to think the creed"; therefore among those terms "to

think" or "to teach" is placed "otherwise," that is, in another way, with the meaning changed.

On the third argument — whether private persons may expound the faith:

The third argument accuses and reproaches us, because we say it is permitted for private persons to expound the faith in whatever words they wish, but that universally all are prohibited. To this we say — as has been said many times before — that someone could privately and particularly expound the faith; there is no one who forbids it. But to present it as something common and universal, which could bring danger and hand on something other than that one thing, and to make additions in the same — this is what is forbidden. And after this prohibition, there is no one who dares, no council, no church — except you, who made this addition, which was the cause of no good things but of many evils.

On the fourth argument — the omission of the Constantinopolitan Creed at Ephesus: You then added a fourth argument to the foregoing — that in the Council of Ephesus no mention was made of the Constantinopolitan Creed; you used a certain division, namely that those fathers either forgot the Constantinopolitan Creed and made mention only of the Nicene Creed, or, if they remembered it, they passed over it as contrary, or they judged both to be one and the same, as we said — and the Constantinopolitan Creed is contained in the Nicene, and nonetheless differs in wordings — you say it is clear that if the creed is found to be the same and consonant with the other as to sense, it does not matter if they have a difference of wordings. All these things we brought forward before you presented your argument, and we held the question in common; thereafter we brought the solution — namely that this exposition and explanation was made before the prohibition, both by an ecumenical council and concerning great matters most fitting and necessary with respect to the faith, namely concerning the procession of the Trinity, and that by the same reason and place the Constantinopolitan Creed holds. As to the first thing the New Testament observes: let no one bring forward as testimony for things done later those that were previously prohibited, because it was then permitted, afterward it was not reasonably done, and it is clear that it was the cause of no good thing.

On the fifth argument — the definition of the Sixth Council: Your fifth argument was that it is written in the definition of the Sixth Council: "no one ought

to introduce or entertain an alteration of the words that would be to the subversion of what has been defined." And it seems clearly from this that those things are prohibited which were added to the subversion of the true faith. To this therefore we say that all these things truly tend toward the same intention and sense, as we have said. For after the fathers of the council distinguished, in nearly the same words, what has been defined for the safeguarding of the creed, and after they added these words — "to think or to teach nothing otherwise," as is stated in the definition of the Sixth Council — the council afterward added: to entertain no novelty of words "that has regard to subversion." These words indeed have regard to the creed, and since they forbid the alteration of the creed and the change and refinement of its words, this is consonant with our reasoning; for those things are forbidden which tend to the subversion of what has been defined by them — that is, to the subversion of the prohibition. For in the same place they defined that not even a syllable or a word should be added to the creed. For it says "of those who distinguished," not "of those who defined," and the council defined concerning the faith — it does not say "distinguished." This is precisely the distinction which was derived from the safeguarding of the creed. But whoever dares to alter the creed subverts what was defined by the fathers; and whoever would attempt to draw that word to cover every sense of the prohibition, so that no novelty of words or invention of terms should be imposed upon the creed, we will say simply that also the definitions of that council concern the dogmas of piety. And just as this argument is no obstacle, so it also confirms our reasoning.

On the sixth argument — the intention of the prohibition as drawn from the preceding acts: The sixth argument is this: having examined the intention of this holy law from the preceding acts leading to the deposition of Nestorius, in which the Nicene Creed was read — after this, the letters of Cyril to Nestorius and the letters of Nestorius himself, parts of which letters were condemned — the intention of the definition therefore appears to be such, from what Cyril afterward says, namely that "we, following the profession of the fathers, follow the intention of the sense and expound the right faith," and similarly the Seventh Council says: "having examined and discussed with diligence, we take nothing away from the intention of truth, we add nothing." From all of which the defined intention seems to be not that the truth should be kept silent, but rather that it should be spoken, preached, and taught. These are your words. To these we say that the intention of the definition

from among the bishops who are now present, do not know the acts of the councils; or, when he learned of it, he interpreted it to a different sense, and not to the sense of Dioscorus, and therefore he said: "there is no canon which says this" — namely, what Eutyches was saying: that one who taught and thought this faith would be subject to the condemnations of the fathers, but that one who altered the faith according to the wording — which Flavian was not doing; on the contrary, while preserving the wordings of the creed, he understood and taught by a different faith, but not an alien one. But this is not forbidden — to teach outside the text other things that are consonant. It seems by all accounts that Flavian was unjustly deposed; for he transgressed neither the definitions nor did he introduce another creed as you have done, and these things are certain for us. And this you concede, unless you wish to contradict the most evident things.

CARDINAL. Do you wish to say more?

EPHESIAN. I wish moreover to cite one witness, and we wish to bring forward one who was the prince of your Roman Church, who is the expositor of all the definitions and especially the confirmer of our reasoning — the most holy Pope Vigilius of older Rome, whom we are truly bound to obey, and you to imitate — you, I say, who have succeeded to his dignity. Let him then be as the seal of our reasoning. In that letter which he directed to Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople, he says the following:

The Letter of Vigilius: "To his most beloved brother Eutychius, Vigilius. Our mouth has been filled with joy and our tongue with exultation. We have always kept and will keep from the beginning the faith which was handed down from the beginning to the great God and Savior Jesus Christ by the holy apostles, and preached by them throughout the whole world, and declared by the holy fathers, and especially by the fathers who came together in the four holy councils, which we accept in all things — that is, the **CCCXVIII** holy fathers who came together at Nicaea, who set forth the holy creed, that is, the teaching of the faith, and who anathematized the fury of Arius and those who thought the same; we admit the **CL** holy fathers who came together at Constantinople, who declared the same holy teaching and expressed what concerns the divinity of the Holy Spirit, and condemned the heresy of Macedonius, the adversary of the Spirit, and Apollinaris himself and those who thought these things and think them; we accept the **CC** holy

fathers who came together in the city of Ephesus, who in all things followed the same holy creed and teaching, and condemned Nestorius and his wicked dogmas and those who thought or held similar things; together with these we receive the **VCLX** who came together at Chalcedon, who in all things agreed with the aforesaid holy councils and followed the aforesaid creed or teaching which was set forth by the **CCC** holy fathers and declared by the **CL**, and they anathematized those who would dare to teach or believe in the holy churches of God anything besides the said creed," etc.

EPHESIAN. You heard, reverend fathers, what was said by the most holy Pope Vigilius; he himself says that the creed was set forth by the Nicene fathers and declared by the Constantinopolitan, and by the fathers of the Council of Ephesus and Chalcedon; he does not say "set forth" nor "declared," but "confirmed and received," and that all these fathers followed that creed; he says those are anathematized who would dare to teach or hand on to the holy churches anything besides the said creed — in which words no particular creed can be understood, since a particular one is not handed on to the holy churches, and you do not say the contrary. In what way could he have said "other than the said" if he had said the contrary? For the contrary is not said "besides this," but "contrary to this"; but "other" is said "besides this" and with the meaning of the said things changed, and this is clearly apparent to all who are unwilling to despise it.

On the deposit of the creed: For we ask, reverend fathers, for the deposit of the holy fathers who came together in the royal city of Constantinople — restore it to us just as you received it from us. If someone entrusted something to you in deposit, are you not obliged to return it as you held it? Return to us the creed of the fathers as you received it; it does not admit of addition beyond what was concluded by those fathers, and those who would dare to change it are rejected, and those who would wish to do something other than this are constrained by penalties. Does it seem little to you that something was added to the creed, and do you make light of the gravity of such a matter? If it were removed it would therefore harm nothing or little — indeed it would profit greatly. For for one and all Christians it is a great thing that has been touched, and the matter concerning it is weighty; therefore we are not wrong if we attach great importance to it on account of some particle appended, and so by dispensation let it be removed. And do you embrace the

brothers whose laceration you see — you who lacerate the bond of charity. We beseech you, as honorable fathers and lords, by the bowels of our Lord Jesus Christ, who loved us though we were unprofitable and desperate, and who laid down his soul for us. Let us return to that best pursuit which ought to exist both among us and among those fathers, which we had before the addition was made and there was no schism between us. Let us acknowledge one another, let us venerate the fathers, let us honor the definitions, let us fear the penalties, let us keep the traditions, so that all together with one mouth we may glorify the most honorable name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, now and always, unto the ages of ages. Amen.

CARDINAL. With the pleasure of your graces.

EPHESIAN. Speak plainly on account of the notaries.

CARDINAL. I will. Reverend and most beloved fathers: I have understood what you have just set forth, and setting aside the preambles I will come to the matter itself. Your paternity said that you wished to respond to the eight articles composed by me, because those seemed more pertinent than the others. I gave you twenty in writing, afterward at various times more than eight or ten further ones, which in truth are no less pertinent than those — indeed they press all the more. Leaving these aside, I come to the first, and you say first concerning Charisius that he contributed nothing to us, because he made a private creed; we are dealing with the universal one. To this I respond that he contributed and contributes much, although between us the question concerns the universal creed. Nonetheless, concerning this added word and whether it was permitted to be done, the question arises from the understanding of the wording of the third council.

On the meaning of "another faith" in the third council's prohibition: You seem to understand those words "another faith" as meaning: with other words, even if true — and that the text is understood concerning another creed, even if true but in different words. I was arguing that Charisius sufficiently set forth his faith through different words than the Nicene Creed, and he was not reprimanded; therefore from this I understand that the prohibited sense encompasses diversity of faith in effect, not in word. And as I said, the text does not distinguish between a universal or particular or common or private creed — indeed I have often said that

a private person is prohibited by this text. For if the understanding of the definition had been concerning words alone, Charisius would have been greatly reprimanded.

On the second point — the word "to think" (*sapere*): Secondly, your paternity said that I had said that this prohibition forbade not only to profess but also to think; you say that the word "to think" is not in the first part of the text, but the word "to profess" and "to teach," but in the second part of the definitions, where the dogma of the Nestorians is censured, "those who believe or think" is placed **On the teaching of Augustine and Ambrose and the *Filioque*:** Moreover, the teaching of Augustine and Ambrose was known before the time of the third council. Likewise, the teaching of many Greek doctors was known to the Eastern doctors, and yet no one was scandalized against them. Therefore let it not be said that this word *Filioque* was the cause of the schism; nor did division follow from it.

EPHESIAN. For what reasons then?

CARDINAL. The cause of a past dispute is not to be rehearsed; I wish to use words that are suited to peace, not to strife. Finally, on the argument of the omission of the Constantinopolitan Council — that no mention was made of it — since you say that it was before the prohibition: as I said in writing, let us suppose that the prohibition forbids another creed to be made; let us discuss the meaning of these words with respect to the creed. I am not speaking about the prohibition as before or after, but about the meaning. You said that what does not differ in sense, but in words, ought to be reckoned one and the same within the Nicene; so our creed, since it is the same, is not another.

EPHESIAN. I spoke without diversity, and I did not say "the same" but "other." You take from me a meaning that I did not express, concerning that Constantinopolitan creed alone.

CARDINAL. By the same reasoning by which you were moved to say that of the Constantinopolitan, I am moved to say of ours that it should be called the same. Then I prove it through other authorities. I say that in the seventh synod the faith of Tarasius and Theodore was read, which differed in many words, and yet it was said that there was one and the same identity. Likewise in the fourth council they say that the decrees of Ephesus and Nicaea agreed so much that they thought or

defined nothing different. Therefore diversity and identity are not judged by words but by understanding. I say that this prohibition was also made before the third council. I proved it through Celestine, then through Cyril, thirdly through the first synod, and your paternity made no response. Then let you hear the letter of Pope Liberius.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek, then in Latin, in these words:

LETTER OF POPE LIBERIUS: "Liberius the pope, to his beloved brother Athanasius and to all the bishops of Egypt gathered together who know the right faith, greeting.

From the beginning we received from the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, the trust that we have the authority on behalf of the universal church to defend the right faith, so that it be permitted to no one to disturb the state of the church to the injury of right believers. We caused your letter directed to us to be read aloud to us; we understood the tribulations which you suffer for the right faith. Concerning these things we, together with you, sharing your grief, are ready to labor for you as a father for a son. We find the faith of the Nicene Council rightly stated in the same letter; we give thanks — for which we are ready to endure not only persecutions but also, if necessary, to die for the name of Christ, insofar as our frailty allows, we do not refuse. Therefore the aforesaid Nicene Council defined that faith — 'it is not permitted to put forward, to think, or to teach otherwise, nor to hold or to put forward anything in the faith that could oppose these rules of the fathers; but whoever shall have presumed to think, to teach, or to put forward another faith, or to hand on another creed to those who desire to be converted to the truth of the faith, whether Jews or pagans wishing to become Christians — if they are bishops or clergy, removed from the episcopate or clergy; if monks or laity, they wished them to be anathematized.'"

CARDINAL. I also proved through another authority that a similar prohibition was made before the canons of Nicaea. Hence we have not only the testimony of Liberius but also of Vigilus — and this ought to be understood only of the understanding itself, not of the words. Otherwise he would seem to contradict himself, thinking one thing in the letters and another in the definitions. Likewise the entire synod said that he thinks the same as the Nicene faith. Hence the synod

itself, which made the prohibition, understands it to be the same — which is consonant with the sense.

On the Seventh Council and the phrase "adding or subtracting nothing":

Afterward you responded to my statement from the Seventh Council, where I said: "following the intentions of truth," and you say that that understanding works for you, because further on it says: "adding or subtracting nothing." I say that you cannot deny that we ought to follow truth, not words. And what you think is for you — because it says "adding nothing" — consider that it is against you, because there it expounds the faith of Nicaea and the other councils, and speaks above concerning all of them.

EPHESIAN. How are the lower parts to be understood?

CARDINAL. The lower parts are understood through the upper parts. It is certain that in other councils nothing was defined concerning images, and yet there it is done, and yet the synod says it adds nothing.

EPHESIAN. It was a tradition of the church.

CARDINAL. This definition had not been made in any council before the seventh. It therefore adds, and yet says: "it adds nothing." Hence one must understand that it adds nothing against the truth, but rather further explicates what was in sacred scripture. Then you responded to my statement concerning the blessed Leo, and you say that Leo did not make another creed. I respond that by the prohibited words — or according to your sense — it is equally forbidden to make definitions as a creed, and nonetheless Leo together with the Council of Chalcedon made another definition. From this it is given to be understood that the prohibition encompasses a contrary creed and a contrary definition, because since the prohibition encompasses both, will not both be forbidden or both permitted?

On the addition of the *Filioque* and the Roman Church: To what you say — that the Roman Church did not make this addition with due diligence — I say the contrary: because it made it maturely, following the truth and the sacred scriptures, the Greek and Latin doctors. And because yesterday you said that whoever appended this dogma made a third testament, I say that whoever removes these words removes the New Testament — indeed even the Old — because since the

Old is the figure of the New, if the New is attacked, the Old is also attacked, because one is contained in the other.

On Flavian and the Bishop of Dorylaeum: Then you responded about Flavian and the bishop of Dorylaeum, and you said that this profits us nothing, because Flavian did not make a creed, and they understood that it was not permitted to make definitions, and therefore they understood badly, and therefore their sentence was revoked. I say that the cause of the revocation was that the truth had been condemned. Then, because they truly did not understand that definition well — because they understood that it was not permitted to add either in or outside the creed — the council disapproves of this interpretation, understanding that it is permitted, provided nothing is added against the truth. And this is declared by Bishop Diogenes who was there, who responded in these words: "They are treacherously putting forward the Nicene faith"; for it received those additions on account of the errors of Macedonius. Hence he understood that the creed admits of addition, if it is consonant with truth — both private and common creed — provided it is done for the truth, not what is against the truth, because that can be done neither by the church nor by anyone else.

On the analogy between the Gospel and the Creed: You then subjoined that just as to the Gospel so also to the creed nothing ought to be added, and on this you greatly founded your argument. Pay careful attention, I ask, because I hope to remove all doubt. It is true that no one dared to add another word to the text of the Gospel, nor to the scripture of the other saints. For if someone were to say "Christ says such a word" when he did not say it, he would be speaking a lie; and so it is concerning the letters of Cyril and of any doctor — understood of the bare voice of the words. If Christ were to appear to us and say: "let such a word be appended in the Gospel" — would anyone doubt that this would be permitted? Certainly not. And if John in the Apocalypse, reviving among us, had wished to add — could he not have done so? Likewise concerning the blessed Augustine, who added much to the book *On the City of God* when he reviewed it. Now the creed made at Nicaea, and made by the apostles, exists through the church and the authority of the church; for that church which was then is the same now and unto the end of the world, and so it can always itself add, because this addition is not made by outsiders but by itself. And what I have said about the church, the same must be

said about the one who has the power of the universal church — namely the supreme pontiff. And that the supreme pontiff has the power of the universal church is clearly proven both through the Gospels and the councils and from the holy Greek and Latin doctors. And you heard in the letter of the blessed Liberius, who says that he has authority from the Lord to decree the truth on behalf of the universal church. And since this is another article, I do not wish to enter upon it, but when we come to it we will clearly show this.

EMPEROR. You have spoken about this matter many times and have not permitted ours to say anything. For we in one respect wished to pass it by, but in another respect, because it touches us, we will produce our rights if you permit us; for in these things we are not without resources.

CARDINAL. If your serenity had understood everything, you would not have said this. I said that I do not now wish to enter upon this matter, but there will be a time for it. And I said only one word, in equating the church with the supreme pontiff. And since you, lord Ephesian, cited Vigilius, saying that there are two things there which work against us — that it was declared in Constantinople and afterward received — I say that this avails little, because we have elsewhere that in this synod it was declared — namely in the act of the third synod, where it is said that Cyril shed great light on the creed, because Nestorius understood it badly; it was necessary that Cyril and the synod declare it more fully, nor was only the creed received but also declared — since Nestorius was not admitted, speaking according to the mere words of the Nicene Creed, unless he approved those twelve chapters. And in the fifth council it is said that Vigilius anathematizes those who think anything other than the creed. These words, understanding "another creed," because he says: "who besides the said creed" — if "another" were understood as "another word," it would be a bad sense, because anyone who says any word would incur the penalty. Therefore whoever says another word would be anathema. But if "another" is understood as "another creed" — I say it is understood as another, that is, a corrupt or evil one, or one outside the sense of piety, and in this way it stands well.

On the deposit of faith and the conclusion: To what you last asked about the deposit, I say that ours is one and the same, and that the holy fathers of the Nicene synod cared about truth and not about verbal syllables — because it is said in the

third synod that the Nicene synod came to declare the faith; our church, declaring that dogma, declared the faith of the Nicene synod and the evangelical and apostolic faith. If peace is desired, let the members come together with their head, and adhering to the words of Pope Julius, who uses these words: "It is unworthy for any pontiff or other to refuse that rule which he sees the see of the blessed Peter both to teach and to hold; it greatly befits that the whole body of the church should agree with the apostolic see in the same observance, where Christ placed the primacy of the whole church." Do you not clearly see that the entire foundation of your contention rests badly, because you assert the prohibition was made in the third synod? And yet I have shown, more clearly than light, that the prohibition was made before, and thus the prohibition necessarily shows itself to be directed toward the false faith, unless we wished to assert that the fathers of the Constantinopolitan Council were struck with anathema — which none of us would admit. Do you not see that you have asserted only two creeds, while we have most clearly demonstrated a third — that of the apostles? And I have clearly shown that in the Constantinopolitan Creed the word "from the heavens" is missing, with which word both we and you sing the creed. It is clearer than light that the prohibition does not extend to words and syllables, but to a diversity of sense and a contrariety of faith; without prejudice to the fact that even if the prohibition were verbal in nature, the addition would be forbidden — since if this positive constitution of a prohibition were the case, I would show more clearly than the sun that the very same church, or the supreme pontiff holding the power of that same church, cannot be bound by this prohibition. Concerning these matters — even if we were to correct some things — would we not be mixing in the article of the church's power? I wished by this process to satisfy you and to show, more clearly than the sun, that the intention of the fathers does not extend except to words and syllables that change the faith, not to those that declare the truth.

On the hope for reunion and a closing appeal: And because I hope, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, that you will all soon be joined in the same bond of charity, I do not wish to exasperate you with other words, but I ask only that we have regard for the truth and remove from our minds those things which could take away the knowledge of truth, and that we embrace it with all our senses.

ANDREAS. The hour had already struck twenty-three, entering into the twenty-fourth, and with all agitated by cold, hunger, and sustained attention, an end was made to the colloquy of that day. And upon these matters the end was placed to the question of the verbal addition that had been proposed, so that the fathers might turn to the disputed question of the procession. And the matter had been set in order as follows: but because the suspicion of plague, with the heats of the approaching summer growing, threatened to infect the sacred assembly, a conclusion having been reached to transfer the council to Florence, the matter of the procession was deferred to the Florentine Council. And so in the cathedral church of Ferrara, in the order and manner in which they had come together for the declaration of the ecumenical council — with the supreme pontiff present, and the Latin and Greek fathers with their emperor, the patriarch being absent due to illness but with a legitimate proxy mandate having been designated — it was decreed that the council be transferred, with the Greeks consenting, from the city of Ferrara to the city of Florence. The words of the decree of transfer, read in general session by the lord Anthony, Bishop of Portugal, were as follows:

The Decree of Transfer of the Council

Eugenius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, for perpetual record of the matter.

On the necessity of a healthy location for the council: It is fitting that the location of an ecumenical council — to which men chosen from the whole Christian world come together, and in which, among other things necessary for men, the healthiness of the air is of the greatest importance — should be such that, on account of the pestilential contagion of infected air, which all naturally fear, flee, and dread, those who are present at the council are not compelled to depart thence with the matter unfinished, and that those who are absent do not refuse to come there. It is truly expedient that those who gather for the handling of weighty matters in synods should be free from every other care and every fear, so that they may attend to public affairs more quietly and freely.

On the desire to remain in Ferrara: We would have wished to continue this same universal council, which we began in this city, in the same place, and happily to complete it there with a perfect union of the Western and Eastern Churches, and to place the desired end where we gave the beginning. And although, when the plague

afflicted this city in the last autumn, an urgent request was made by many that the synod itself be transferred to an uninfected place, yet because — as is customary — it was hoped that with the onset of winter it would entirely cease, it was postponed until the present day.

On the decision to transfer to Florence: But since it persists day by day, and it is reasonably feared that it will grow more virulent in the coming spring and summer, all judge and advise that it is not merely useful but necessary that the council be moved immediately to another place free from this disease — among those which from the beginning of this sacred council we provided to all with full security and safe-conducts. For these and several other reasonable causes, therefore, with the consent of our most beloved son John Palaeologus, Emperor of the Romans, and our venerable brother Joseph, Patriarch of Constantinople, and with the approval of the sacred council, we transfer by the tenor of these presents, in the name of the Holy Trinity — Father and Son and Holy Spirit — this same ecumenical or universal synod from this city of Ferrara to the city of Florence, manifestly free, secure, peaceful, and quiet for all, rejoicing in the healthiness of its air, and most advantageously situated between the Tyrrhenian and Adriatic Seas, to which access can conveniently be made by Easterners and Westerners alike; and we decree it to have been transferred, with all the full securities and safe-conducts which we provided to all at the beginning of this sacred council.

Prohibition against contravening the decree: Let no person whatsoever be permitted to infringe this document of our transfer and constitution, or to oppose it with reckless presumption. But if anyone shall have presumed to attempt this, let him know that he will incur the indignation of Almighty God and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at Ferrara, in public session solemnly celebrated in the cathedral church, in the year of the Lord's incarnation one thousand four hundred and thirty-eight, on the fourth day before the Ides of January, in the eighth year of our pontificate.

ANDREAS. With this transfer, then, we shall bring to a close our account of this day, a new matter prompting it, to return on another day, on which we shall record what was declared in the most devout Catholic disputations at Florence. Farewell.

LUDOVICUS. And farewell to you; tomorrow, I pray, meet me in this place as promised.

ANDREAS. It shall be done. Farewell again.

LUDOVICUS. Go well, dearest brother.

PUBLIC COLLOQUIA OF FLORENCE

The Arrival of the Greeks at Florence

THE THIRD BOOK ON THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT,
DISCUSSED AT FLORENCE.

ANDREAS. LUDOVICUS. PROVINCIALIS. EPHESINUS. CARDINAL.
EMPEROR. COLLOCENSIS.

ANDREAS. Although I came here festively to the appointed place, your eagerness anticipated me.

LUDOVICUS. What we heard yesterday stirred my mind more as a preamble to knowledge than it soothed it; in my judgment, given the notion of the procession of the Holy Spirit, those things were not very well suited to the faith. Greatly stirred up by the discussions of the previous day, I returned eagerly to the appointed place to hear what followed, so that we might convert the tedium of the addition — which contains not divine but positive law, to use your term — into joy. Relate, I pray, the progress of the promised matter.

ANDREAS. At Florence, when the supreme and greatest pontiff, the emperor, and the patriarch, and the Latin and Greek fathers had arrived, they established the progress of the disputations.

On the reception of the Greeks at Florence

LUDOVICUS. I ask that, before the contests of the disputations, you relate in what order the Greeks were received. I know that the Florentine citizens are, as they appear, eager in these receptions.

ANDREAS. The patriarch, with two cardinals going out to meet him beyond the gate — the lord of Colonna and the lord of Fermo, otherwise known as deacon cardinals of Santa Maria in Via Lata — was conducted into the city with the company of many prelates and accompanied to his lodging. He arrived before the emperor. It was observed that the Florentines did something special on that day: their officials, whom they call lords, descended for the occasion to a certain seat before their palace and waited until the patriarch, passing by, came to them. When he arrived they rose, and through their interpreter Leonardo Aretino, chancellor of their lordship, they offered him many words in Greek; and when he departed they entered the palace. There were no public spectacles, since it was not a feast day — for you know that these peoples hold most joyful celebrations on feast days, while on other days they devote themselves to tireless labor.

On the Emperor's arrival and the disrupting rain: But because the emperor arrived on a feast day and entered the city on the Sunday of Carnival, they had made great preparations, with men and ladies along every street; for the chief display of that city consists of adorned ladies and men, as you well know. The rain, however, took away the splendor of the spectacle. For unexpectedly, as soon as the emperor had crossed the threshold of the city, so great a rain came that every procession took shelter — indeed the established order of the streets, disrupted by the storm of rain, was not maintained, but he was conducted home by a shorter and quicker route. And what was even more remarkable: as soon as he had crossed the threshold of his house, the rain stopped. All the cardinals had also come to the gate of the city, and thoroughly soaked by that storm, they accompanied him home. The lords of the city came on foot to the city gate, and through their chancellor Leonardo Aretino addressed many words to him, in which they recalled how most welcome they found his arrival.

On the private meeting before the public disputations: This rain having prevented it, no new spectacle was held. It was arranged that the disputations should proceed. However, the Greeks, so wishing, requested a certain private meeting before they came out into public — of which I would not even make mention, since I have decided to record only what was done publicly. But because it was a preamble to the public disputations which are to be recounted, I will say some words about it. Forty from our side and the same number from the Greeks

were requested to come to a certain colloquy. When all had assembled in the apostolic palace in a private gathering — with the supreme pontiff, the emperor, and eighty others — the lord of Santa Sabina, surnamed Sant'Angelo, put forward the following in their midst:

The opening address: "Brothers and men, many things have been said up to now. It seems altogether superfluous to insist on these, but we must come to declaring the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit."

The Emperor's response: The emperor replied that he thought some middle ground had been found; but through arriving at the disputation on the procession of the Holy Spirit, he did not intend to depart from the first position. To which a response was given by the most reverend lord that at any time, if they doubted about any matter, they would be most fully satisfied on the same. And they agreed that a public convention should be held on the second of March.

THE THIRTEENTH PUBLIC COLLOQUY, HELD ON THE SECOND DAY OF MARCH.

In the first assembly at Florence, with all convening in the order and manner as was reported at Ferrara, at which neither the emperor nor the patriarch was present. The Provincial of Lombardy began in the following manner.

On the opening of the disputation on the procession of the Holy Spirit

PROVINCIAL. Undertaking, with the blessing of our most holy lord, the office enjoined upon me of satisfying and disputing concerning the faith of the procession of the Holy Spirit that is in us — where, according to the judgment of the most blessed Augustine in the first book *On the Trinity*, one must proceed with modesty and fear, and listen with the most attentive and devout ears — first of all, if anything has been said or expounded by me less skillfully and with insufficient caution, I desire it to be corrected by that same Holiness which holds the faith and the see of Peter, and also by my most reverend assisting fathers.

On the rules for the disputation: Consequently, since among us, when divine matters have begun to be treated, there ought to be no quarrel over words but rather the carefully sought truth of words, we judge that hope must be conceived in him

who illuminates the mind and leads into all truth, as the Son of God promised. For thus we hope in the goodness of God, since he who willed that this cause concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit should be raised in the present holy and ecumenical synod, must grant through that same Spirit that with all meekness and modesty its truth may shine forth, and that all may be instructed without schism and contention of truth, so that at last with one mouth and one heart, according to the saying of the Apostle, we all say the same thing, and just as there is one Christ and one faith, so may we be in one faith, the same body in Christ.

Now, with these things premised, I come to the matter itself, and first three things are to be notified. **First:** since the most serene emperor said several times at Ferrara in a colloquy of this kind that it seemed to him, for easier dispatch, that we should not make lengthy speeches but proceed from argument to argument, or from testimony to testimony, or from chapter to chapter — as you, reverend fathers, also said at times — our most holy lord, wishing to comply with his serenity and with these fathers, and also considering that matters are more easily dispatched in this manner, is content that in the following and in the present disputation we maintain this method.

Third is to be notified: that the most blessed Augustine says at the beginning of the book *On the City of God* that there would be no end to disputation if one had to respond to those who argue from those things with which they argue, and to render account of their reasonings. Therefore it seems that this ought to be established among us: that in the present discussions we hold the testimonies of the scriptures and of the holy fathers who are admitted by the church, and afterward the reasons that are added, as the boundaries of our disputation which neither the one arguing nor the one responding may transgress. And this is taught us by the holy fathers, especially by the most blessed Pope Agatho in his letter cited by us above, addressed to the Emperor Constantine at the **VI** ecumenical synod, in which, speaking of his apocrisaries, he said thus: "To which apocrisaries we entrusted also the testimonies of certain holy fathers whom the apostolic see has received, together with their books, so that, having obtained from your most Christian empire the faculty of presenting suggestions, they may strive to satisfy from these alone." The holy fathers of the Council of Chalcedon say the same in that address delivered to Martian, beginning "And indeed this befitted your empire," speaking

of the letter of Leo to Flavian: "It is therefore not to be wondered at that the leaders of the Roman city reproach the letter as if it were an obstacle to admiration, but let them refute it if it is not grounded in the divine scriptures, if it is not combined with the judgments of the preceding fathers" — and further on: "and let occasion be left in the city for these and some who tear apart the apostolic man. We send a few from many testimonies of the holy fathers consonant with his letter for the more certain knowledge of your piety."

On the first question: what is meant by "procession": With these things premised, descending to the matter itself — since in any disputation the meaning of the name is always put first — since a discourse on the procession of the Holy Spirit ought to be among us, we inquire first from you what is understood by the name of procession, whether in human or in divine things, and the reason for the inquiry is this: because according to the judgment of the blessed Dionysius in the book *On the Divine Names*, we know God himself from creatures, and in sacred scripture this name "procession" is attributed not only to the Holy Spirit but also to the Son. It is said in the seventh chapter of John: "I proceeded from God and came." And of the Holy Spirit it is said that he proceeds from the Father. And this has been said for the reason that we believe that among all other matters you ought to hold this one first and especially. Say what you will.

ANDREAS. The Greeks conferred briefly among themselves, then one of them spoke.

EPHESIAN. Reverend fathers and lords, as to the first things that were said by the reverend father — since they are outside the matter proposed and also seem the same to both of us — it is not opportune to respond to all of them particularly at present. But to that inquiry put to us by you, we respond thus: that the name of procession is said diversely, both in human and in divine things. For in divine things it is suitable for the two processions of the divine persons, but most of all and properly, according to theological reasoning, it is said of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, both in sacred scripture and among all the saints of the church. By this name also the essential procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father is distinguished and differentiated from the procession of the Son from the Father. For one of these processions is called nativity, the other procession. Many of these names are predicated of some things both properly and in common.

Therefore it is no wonder if this name of procession is sometimes, though rarely, said of the procession of the Son from the Father. Furthermore, the word "went out" from the Father signifies something different from "I proceeded from the Father." Nonetheless, the mode of the procession of the Spirit from the Father is called ineffable and incomprehensible among theologians, since the mode of such nativity is most well known among us. Therefore concerning this procession, Damascene says: "This mode of essence is incomprehensible and different from the nativity of the Son." These are the things I wished to respond.

PROVINCIAL. We have understood the procession in divine things from the response, from which response three things are elicited. **First:** that the name of procession in divine things is common to the Son and the Holy Spirit. **Second:** that it is more proper to the Holy Spirit than to the Son, and the reason is that procession by way of a word is more known to us than from the side of the will. Therefore the name of procession is not attributed to the Holy Spirit exclusively. **Third:** it is said that the procession is essential. Now I ask about this third point: since in the divine persons there is found nothing but essence, property, or relation — what does it mean to say that the procession is essential in a divine person? Is one to understand that essence, being, or substance is received from another, because procession seems to be a going forth? But if it is an essential procession, then the Spirit receives essence from the Father, and since being is the same as essence, they are therefore entirely the same once the other is taken. I ask whether you understand that procession to be essential. Speak, so that we may conclude.

EPHESIAN. I understand such a procession of the Spirit from the Father, by which the Spirit receives being and everything that it is; this is properly called the Holy Spirit.

PROVINCIAL. Very well. We have this conclusion: that to understand the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father is real being. Then I say thus: From whom the Holy Spirit in divine things receives being, from that one it is said to proceed. But it is said that the Holy Spirit receives being from the Son. Therefore the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son in the proper signification of procession, as you said. That the Spirit receives being from the Son can be shown by many testimonies. Speak.

EPHESIAN. We now grant the premise, but we deny the last part; and therefore we ask that you show that the Holy Spirit receives being from the Son.

On the first authority — Epiphanius

PROVINCIAL. It is well that this has been said, because we will thus conclude that the Holy Spirit receives being from the Son. **First** it is shown by the authority of Saint Epiphanius, who in a certain work called the Ancoratus — and the general of the Camaldolese transcribed that authority from the book in Greek — first says thus: "The Father calls him Son who is from himself; but the Holy Spirit, who alone is from both." Now from this, if the Spirit is from both, he therefore receives being. Likewise in the same work he says this: "Just as no one knows the Father except the Son, nor the Son except the Father, so I dare to say: nor does anyone know the Holy Spirit except the Father and the Son, from whom he receives and from whom he proceeds; nor the Son and the Father except the Holy Spirit, who truly glorifies, who teaches all things, who is from the Father and the Son." From this authority, Saint Epiphanius takes "to proceed from the Father" and "to proceed from the Son" and "to be from both" as the same thing. Therefore from this testimony I have that the Spirit receives being from the Son. Speak to this authority.

EPHESIAN. Although you promised to prove that the Spirit receives being from the Son, you have been entirely unable to do so, nor have you produced anything that rests on any doctor of the church, nor can it be gathered from any of them. For if the Holy Spirit is from the Son, it does not on that account proceed from the Son; for "to be" is said in many ways, nor is it necessary that everything which is from something has being from it, so as to conclude what you said. The last authority of the blessed Epiphanius not only does not help, but actually works against you. For Saint Epiphanius did not say that the Spirit receives being from the Son, but that it receives from the Son. Now he said this with occasion taken from the Gospel, in which the Lord said: "he receives from me and announces to you." Hence it seems clear that Saint Epiphanius did not have the intention you attribute to him; for if he had had your intention, he would have said thus, that no one knows the Father and the Son except the Holy Spirit, from whom he proceeds and receives — and in this way he would have shown receiving and being to be the same. But when he distinguishes by the pronoun and introduces "from whom he proceeds" and "from

whom he receives," he signifies that proceeding and receiving are different, and that "to proceed" signifies subsistence given to him from the Father, while "to receive" signifies consonance and equality and co-glorification with the Father and the Son, according to which the Spirit himself announces to the disciples what is to be announced, with the occasion taken from the Son. Therefore this authority does nothing to the purpose; from neither of these is it concluded that the Spirit receives being from the Father and the Son.

Here the blessed Cyril and Chrysostom testify with me, of whom the blessed John, expounding the evangelical authority, says: the Spirit receives from the Son — he says "he will receive from me," that is, from what I have said — "that is, from my knowledge, namely that which is consonant with it, he declares." But the blessed Cyril in the Thesauri, expounding the same annotation, says: "for the Son did not signify a difference of nature between himself and the Spirit, saying 'who will receive from me and announce to you,' if he uses those words on account of the identity of substance and the altogether equal nature of the same and the equality of the same honor." But since the fathers understood thus what is said about the words — that the Spirit receives from the Son and announces to the apostles — we certainly cannot take from this expression that the Spirit receives being from the Son.

PROVINCIAL. We have heard what you said, wishing to remove the sense of that holy man Epiphanius; but now I wish to press that that is the intention of Epiphanius which I stated — that for something to be from another can in no other way be understood except as receiving its being from that other. We say, and the blessed Dionysius says in the second chapter On the Divine Names, that creatures are from God. Now I ask you: when it is said that creatures are from God, is it understood that they receive being from God?

EPHESIAN. It is said that this is so, but it does not on that account follow that everything that comes to be from another therefore receives being.

PROVINCIAL. Do you confess: the creature is from God, therefore it receives being from God?

EPHESIAN. We confess this of creatures, because they are said to be in the very mode by which they receive being.

PROVINCIAL. You grant the reasoning for creatures. Now in the saying of Epiphanius, when he says "the Spirit is from the Son" — does this word "is" import being, or does it import that being which it receives from the Son, or something else? It cannot be said that it imports a being foreign to the Father; therefore it seems necessary to conclude that it receives that being which the Father has, since there is one being in divine things, and that being is received when it is said "it is from the Son." **Second:** Epiphanius in this saying premises two sayings of the Gospel.

EPHESIAN. Let us examine this first authority.

PROVINCIAL. I wish to state this authority, because it is said in the same context.

EPHESIAN. Let the authority be read.

PROVINCIAL. I stated it word for word.

EPHESIAN. Let it be read, because that book is regarded with suspicion by us.

PROVINCIAL. I wish to press that wherever it is found: "it is the Spirit; therefore it receives being from the Son."

EPHESIAN. Let it be read.

PROVINCIAL. Presuppose that it is so, and the book will come; and you have conceded that it is from the Son, but does not receive being. We are sending for the book; in the meantime let us presuppose this authority: "No one knows the Spirit except the Father and the Son, from whom he receives, from whom he proceeds" — thus therefore continuing, he says: "nor does anyone know the Son and the Father except the Spirit, who truly glorifies, who teaches all things, who is from the Father and the Son." And what he first said — "receives" — he now says "is." And since in divine things there is one being and this word "is" designates being, therefore it receives that from the Son; and it would necessarily have to be said — if this were not the case, that it is from the Son as creatures are from God — that

this is the judgment of Epiphanius, that by the word "is" he understands receiving essence. Thus he says in the same Ancoratus a little above: "The Holy Spirit always — 'not begotten,' not made, not a co-brother, not a grandson, but 'is of the substance of the Father and the Son.'" Therefore by the word "is" nothing can be understood except that he receives being.

EPHESIAN. You say, reverend father, that because the Spirit is said to be from the Father and the Son, he therefore has being from the Father and the Son — do you understand this in such a way that when the Spirit is said to be from the Father, it is understood as from the person of the Father, when from the Son, as from the person of the Son, and when from both, as from the persons of both?

PROVINCIAL. I say that when we say "being from the Father," I understand it as from the person of the Father; the same when it is said "from the Son," as from the person of the Son; when it is said "from both," that is insofar as they are one principle, because the principle of the Father is communicated from the Father to the Son, and it is one and the same.

EPHESIAN. When you understand the Spirit to be from the Father — that is, from the person of the Father — and from the Son — from the person of the Son — when you say the Spirit is from both, what can be understood except from two persons? Let this stand for now. When we hear "the Spirit from the Father," is it that in order to be from the Father, he also has essence from him? This must be inquired with respect to the person of the Son, since you confess in like manner that the Spirit proceeds from the Son and from the Father. When we hear that the Spirit is from the Father, do you understand that he receives being?

PROVINCIAL. We understand that it is from the Father. We understand: he receives being from the Father, and when we say similarly that it is from the Son, he receives being from the Son, who has one substance with the Father. And it is good that we do not depart from the first argument — namely that to receive being is to have being — lest we depart from the matter of spiration.

EPHESIAN. Now we are not inquiring about the authority, whether the Spirit receives from the Father or from the Son, but about what is said concerning both.

PROVINCIAL. Let us see: when it is said "is from both," whether by this we ought to say that he receives being, or that he is said to be from the Father or from the Son or from both — which is the key to the understanding.

EPHESIAN. On this inquiry we asked before, and you conceded that when it is said "the Spirit is from the Father," he receives being from the person of the Father. Let us see what follows from this concession.

On the authority of Basil against Eunomius

The great Basil, in the sermons he made against Eunomius, when he was reasoning about the procession, says this: "God begets, not as a man, but truly begets, and that which is begotten by him is a word not human; and he sends the Spirit through his mouth, not as it is with a human — since God has no mouth in a bodily sense; the Spirit is from him, and from nowhere else." Now if, when we hear that the Spirit is from him, it is necessary to understand this as being from the same person — Basil has now clearly declared that it is from the person of the Father alone, not from the Son.

PROVINCIAL. What you say does not seem to be inferred from those words; indeed Basil says in the **iii** book against Eunomium that the Holy Spirit receives being from the Son, and this book is most ancient. Furthermore, in what you now say — that the Spirit is sent from the Father, as from the mouth of God — we confess this; and that God does not have a mouth except by way of similitude, and he spoke metaphorically, because in divine scripture "spirit of his mouth" is the same as "proceeding from the word," and understood thus, when it is said "spirit of his mouth," these words serve the purpose; but also what Basil says in the first place cited by me serves the purpose well.

EPHESIAN. Let us first inquire about what has been said, then we will proceed to another authority.

PROVINCIAL. This is a confirmation of the first authority; and let what is Against Eunomium be read: "What necessity is there that the Spirit, being **iii** in person, should be **iii** in essence? In dignity he is indeed second to the Son, having being from him and receiving from him and announcing to us." This authority is a confirmation of the first.

EPHESIAN. We will respond to this afterward; now inquiry must be made about what you first proposed. We ask your paternity: when the blessed Basil says "the Father begets and sends the Spirit through his mouth" — what does he wish to signify when he says that the Father begets? From himself — does he signify from his essence or from his person? And when he says "he sends the Spirit through his mouth," does he signify from his essence or from his person? Explain to us what this word "from himself" signifies.

PROVINCIAL. If you were to respond to the argument that "being" and "is" are the same, I could respond to you. Respond to the question that emanates from the authority of Epiphanius. Moreover, Basil himself says "from the Father." Is what I say impertinent? Respond about Basil — how is that saying of Basil "he receives being from the Son" to be understood?

EPHESIAN. If you had shown by the authority of Epiphanius that the Spirit has being from the Son, we would have granted your proposition, since you proposed this, and you have not yet shown it. The great Epiphanius does not say that the Spirit has being from the Son, but that it is from the Father and the Son — supposing that he says this. To this we asked that you tell us: when you hear that the Spirit is from the Father or the Son, do you understand this as from the persons? And you said yes, because on that basis you cited the authority of Epiphanius. But when we shifted the matter to the authority of the great Basil, we asked similarly whether you understand it thus. Respond to these things — what you think — so that all may be clarified. If you have any authority to the contrary, state it; afterward inquiry will be made about it. Again we ask, and we will not cease asking: do you understand, when you hear that the Spirit proceeds from the Father — that is, from a person — and so from the Son, and so from both?

PROVINCIAL. I responded clearly that it is understood of persons, but you do not respond to my point.

EPHESIAN. According to the confession we obtained from you — since Basil says that it has being from the Father, from him and nowhere else — he himself sufficiently explained that it is from the Father and from nowhere else. This is as much as if he were to say that it proceeds from the Father alone.

PROVINCIAL. Basil disputes in the same place against Eunomius, who held that the Spirit was a creature, and therefore he said "from the Father, not from elsewhere" — "from elsewhere" designates substance, that is, not from another substance. And therefore, so that we do not trample on the matter, I say that the Spirit has being both from the Father and from the Son. Now is the being which it has from the Father different from the being which it has from the Son? It is necessarily the case that the Spirit is from the Father in the unity of essence; therefore the Spirit is from the Father in the unity of the Father's essence, and it is from the Son in the unity of the Son's essence, so that the word "is" placed in the authority of Epiphanius himself is verified — he who says in the same *Ancoratus*: "The Spirit always is, not begotten, not made, not a co-brother, not a grandson, but is of the substance of the Father and the Son." Therefore to be from the Father and from the Son is to receive that essence, according to the testimony of Basil who says "he receives being from the Son," and it is not a different being.

EPHESIAN. Again you have supposed as conceded that the Spirit receives being from the Son — which the great Epiphanius does not say, nor do we concede, nor could you clearly show it from those very words; indeed on the contrary, the opposite is said by the authority of the great Basil. Let us return again to Basil; for you seem to contradict both yourselves and what was first said, because when Basil was attacking Eunomius who said the Spirit was a creature, he said the Spirit is from the Father himself — namely from his essence — and not as one of the creatures, that is, not from another essence. Thus you said.

PROVINCIAL. I would wish you to respond to the question.

EPHESIAN. You seem to say something contradictory: since, according to Basil, you would say "from nowhere but the Father," and first you said "from the Father and the Son," and thus a contradiction.

PROVINCIAL. You introduced that term "from nowhere else." I said that it is from the Father in essence, which is consubstantial with the Father and the Son; the Spirit is from another. Does not Basil expressly declare that being from which it has being — that it receives being from the Son? And thus Epiphanius says concerning the substance of the Father and the Son; therefore it has that being from

the Father and the Son; if it has, then it receives. And this the doctors have founded on the authority of scripture.

On the distinction between essence and person in divine things

EPHESIAN. These things we will indeed examine diligently after this one; but so that the authority of Basil may be more clearly understood, we ask whether, according to the doctors of the church, essence and person are understood to be the same in divine things.

PROVINCIAL. I will respond easily. We say that essence and person are one and the same according to reality, and they differ according to our mode of understanding, such that a person is understood as constituted from essence and property; for because they are distinguished according to reason, the essence itself is communicated to the persons, but the properties are in no way communicated, and this is by virtue of the relation itself. This you have through your Gregory the Theologian in the book On the Epiphanies of the Redeemer: "But the property of each is incommunicable, otherwise it would not be a property, if it were transformed into the other." In order that the distinction of persons may remain, it is necessary that the constitutive properties be immutable. And therefore the doctors say that there is nothing but a relation of origin in divine things, and it is to this relation of origin that they make the separation; for only these two remain distinct: the Father is the Father, the Son is the Son; all else is communicated. And thus Epiphanius wishes to be understood. He wished to speak of the correlatives of origin which constitute the person, and these are two: that by which one is, and that by which one is from another. Since therefore all things are communicated except the properties, it follows that when it is said one is from another, it receives being from another. Now let us declare what I said. Tell me now in answer to my question: how do you understand the saying of Basil?

EPHESIAN. How a person is distinguished from essence in divine things is not something to be considered at the present time; for perhaps in this part we do not differ — namely that a person is distinguished from essence as the proper differs from the common, as the great Basil says writing to his brother Gregory, and just as the essence of man is understood in common, and the person of someone is understood specifically, it seems to me that this also appears the same to us as to

you. Now I come to the first question: because Basil says that "the Father begets from himself and sends the Spirit through his mouth" — what does he wish to signify by "from himself," from a person or from another?

PROVINCIAL. I said that when it is said the Son is begotten from the Father, it is the same as if one says the Son is begotten from the essence of the Father, such that the person is the principle which begets — since "Father" signifies a suppositum — the divine essence is not that which begets, because it is not signified as a suppositum; actions belong to supposita; essence is the principle by which it begets. For which reason we say in human terms: the one who begets is this man, that is, this suppositum, and this is the person which receives and which is the cause — this is because actions are said to belong to supposita; in this man is humanity, this humanity is said to be the principle by which the man is generated, and because of this, this man is not communicated to this son, but nature is communicated, because the son is generated in the same species. What is communicated in lower things is nature; what acts is the suppositum and is the person. Now in divine things we say analogously: the person of the Father is signified as a suppositum; therefore the person of the Father is that which begets. And the principle by which it is generated — the divine nature — is the principle by which this Father begets the Son, and therefore the Father is not communicated, but the essence is. And because it is numerically the same, on account of this it cannot be called something common as humanity is in lower things, but only has the character of the common insofar as it is communicable. This is the reason why the Son is said to be generated from the Father as from a principle; and which is from the divine essence as from a principle, with real identity with each person, because according to all the Greek and Latin doctors, the only thing that multiplies persons in divine things is relation — which is called the relation of origin — to which two things belong: that from which another is, and that which is from another. Now for the Spirit to be from another is nothing other than receiving essence from another. Now it follows that since the relations of origin — "from which another is" and "which is from another" — and there is no other distinction in divine things except through these two, therefore it follows that if any person is from another, it is said to receive being and essence from another. And this is the understanding of the great Epiphanius and Basil when they say that the Spirit has being from the Son. Now this reasoning stands: to be from another in divine things

is the same as to proceed. But it has been shown that the Spirit is from the Son by other authorities; therefore it follows that it proceeds. I believe this to be the true and clear truth, and I would not dare to say otherwise.

On the reading of the Epiphanius authority

ANDREAS. Here the book arrived, and the authority of Epiphanius was read in this manner, first in Greek.

EPHESIAN. Here it says that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son; now in this passage, since it says "from the Father and the Son," it must be understood according to the expositions of his faith — that it is from the Father and receives from the Son.

THE AUTHORITY FOLLOWS: "He himself will glorify me, because he will receive of mine and will announce all things to you; if he proceeds from the Father and will receive from me, just as no one knows the Father except the Son" — and conversely, I dare say thus, that no one knows the Spirit except the Father and the Son from whom he proceeds; nor the Son and the Father except the Spirit, who glorifies us and testifies that he is from the Father and the Son.

EPHESIAN. You see, fathers, that the word "is" does not appear there — which that father was taking as his basis, and by which he wished to argue from that word "being." Here that word "is" does not occur, but it says "from the Father and the Son"; we can understand this according to theology and the doctors in such a way that the Spirit is from the Father and the Son in the sense that he has subsistence from the Father and is received by those who believe in him — and thus this authority does not obstruct us, nor is what you proposed gathered from it.

PROVINCIAL. Because the word "is" is absent when it says "from the Father and the Son," the principal verb is necessarily understood; and the doctors here act in the correlatives of origin — when it is said "from whom another is" and "who is from another." And therefore in this very Ancoratus this word "is" does appear. We say: "who is from him, the Spirit, who is from both." In the **ii** authority it says "the Spirit who is from the Father and the Son." Now I prove that this is necessarily understood, because in that proposition it imports the intention of the proposition "from which"; now there is no procession as there is no procession with respect to

the term "from which," nor in relation to the term "to which." So here, since this relation to the term "from which" is imported, it is of necessity that the term "to which" must be understood. Now the term "to which" of the procession of the Spirit is the suppositum of the Spirit itself, receiving being, because through the procession being is communicated. Therefore "is" is necessarily understood.

EPHESIAN. Even if we were to consider that in these authorities "is" is understood — though this can be understood otherwise, as we said — nonetheless, hearing "from the Father" or "from the Father and the Son," we are not of necessity to understand it as from the substance of the Father or the person of the Father, but we can understand not the distinction by which the Son is from the Father, but rather the unity according to which the Son is of the same nature as the Father — and similarly the Spirit in relation to the Father and the Son. And this we would find in the authorities of the holy doctors of the church, wherever they make mention saying that the Spirit is from the Father and the Son or from their essence, because the Spirit is of the same nature as the Father and the Son. This appears in the authorities of the holy doctors of the church — of the blessed Cyril — gathering from the authorities of scripture, where he concluded that the Spirit is from the essence of the Father and the Son. But so that we may return to the authority proposed, lest it be left unsettled, we say concerning the authority of Basil — since you have not yet responded clearly — that if he speaks of the person as "from his person," and thus that authority is understood in that sense, then "from elsewhere" refers to another hypostasis, and it is clear that he said it is from the person of the Father alone. But if the authority of that saint has regard to the essence of the Father, which is common to both, he says "from himself, not from elsewhere" — that is, not a creature of creatures; for it was manifest that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, nor was it necessary to show this. Therefore Epiphanius, saying "from the Father and the Son," does not of necessity wish to show that it is from those persons, but from their substance, so as to be consubstantial; therefore in divine things it does not follow of necessity from "it is said to be from another" that it has being from that from which it is said to be; but the Spirit can be said to be from the Father and the Son, and from the substance of both, because it is consubstantial.

PROVINCIAL. I have two points from this response. **First:** that taking the word "is" in the authorities, it does not follow that "it is from the Son," meaning that it receives being — which seems to contradict what you were saying first, when we were putting forward "is," and you make a great foundation in the authority of Basil saying that it is from the person of the Father and from nowhere else — therefore it is not from another person. We say that we do not believe Basil is expounding that word "from nowhere else" as meaning "not from another person," because Basil would contradict himself in the same book if he were to say "from nowhere else," that is, "not from another person," and elsewhere say "it has being from the Son" — he would be in contradiction, and therefore you must show, if "from elsewhere" has the sense you say, what that sense is. Here is Basil — let us read him.

CARDINAL. The hour is late; let us rise and meet on Wednesday.

ANDREAS. Refreshed by the spiritual discourse, the sacred assembly was dismissed for that day, the hour now being late.

THE SECOND DISPUTATION AT FLORENCE

On the fifth of March, in the order and manner as has been said and reported many times before, the Provincial began in the following way.

PROVINCIAL. With the blessing of your holiness, we set aside in the preceding act the authority of the blessed Basil adduced by you, reverend father — in which authority you said that the Spirit, according to Basil's intention, is from the mouth of the Father himself and from nowhere else, that is, from no other person, as you expounded. I was responding that the word "from nowhere else" (*aliunde*) was to be understood in this way — that is, from no other substance than that of God. The reason is that Basil holds in the book against Eunomius that the Holy Spirit has being from the Son; he could not therefore say that it was from no other person without contradiction. And on this account I asked that the original text of Basil himself be examined, so that the truth of Basil's intention might become known to

all, since such doctors are the foundations of our faith. We examined the entire chapter of Basil, and with two interpreters we endeavored to translate those words faithfully, with nothing added or removed. Here we have a most ancient Basil translated. And therefore I will first read it in Latin out of respect for the Latins, and then in Greek, or conversely.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek, then in Latin. Wishing to set it forth, he reported as follows.

PROVINCIAL. Since that authority cited by you seemed to carry weight, it was necessary that the intention of Basil appear from what precedes and follows. Now we will say it in Latin. According to the meaning of this chapter, he says the following: In this chapter it is manifestly apparent that the blessed Basil understands "from nowhere else" as meaning from no other substance than that of the Father and the Son.

On the text of Basil against Eunomius: He says a little before: "You, like an unbeliever and adversary of divine scripture, hasten toward blasphemy. And because the procession of the Spirit from God is not called a birth, you therefore do not believe that the Spirit of God's mouth exists, but rather that it is the work of God's hands; and scorning human examples, you overturn the divine dogmas that are known through them — when you ought to hear divine words with fear and receive everything that is said, and not argue most stupidly against piety. God begets not as man, but truly begets, and from himself a sprout." Take note that the word "is" is not here, though it is understood, so that you should not argue from the absence of this word: "he announces a word not human, he truly utters a word, from himself he sends forth the Spirit through his mouth — not in a human manner, because God's mouth is not bodily — the Spirit from himself, from nowhere else."

Now you will see that he argues against those who wished to say that the Spirit was the work of God's hands, and he persuades that it is from none other than the substance of God. It continues: "God works with his hands — not human ones — God works producing not from himself something for the creature, but by working causing it to subsist, just as what a man works with his hands, man does not produce from himself. The Son is the Son, the Spirit is not a creature; do not ask

about the Son why the Spirit is not called in the same way, nor about the Spirit why it is not called Son in the same way, nor blaspheme that the Spirit or the Son is a creature. The Son is God, a holy fruit from a holy one, eternal from an eternal one, the giver of the Holy Spirit unto subsistence and formation of the creature."

Up to this point we have established that "from nowhere else" is understood as meaning from no other substance. Secondly, that the Son is holy from the holy one, eternal from the eternal, the giver of the Holy Spirit. It follows that if he is the giver of the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit receives its being from him. For Athanasius says against the Arians in the iii book: "he himself gives the Spirit" — speaking of the Son — "and whatever the Spirit has, it has from the Word." Now it is clear that the Holy Spirit has being. Therefore if whatever it has, it has from the Son, therefore it has being from the Son. And Athanasius concludes this solely from the fact that he gives the Spirit; therefore from this passage Basil means that the Holy Spirit receives its being from the Son.

Now Basil, in the same chapter — which is a noteworthy chapter relevant to our purpose — says: but you yourselves have seen the authority of Basil, and therefore hear this one, because it is to the same point, in the chapter inscribed: "That unless someone says the Spirit is from God, not even the Word."

EPHESIAN. That authority is from another part.

PROVINCIAL. Very well.

EPHESIAN. Because you are gathering different authorities together as if they were in the same chapter — as you did with the authority of Epiphanius, which appeared to be one but were five — this is not permitted by the intention of a disputation, but introduces confusion. Therefore these first points must be examined.

PROVINCIAL. Speak to the one that you yourself introduced.

EPHESIAN. Here you are gathering from the interpretation of the authority produced by you yesterday, and from all that you have said, that when the blessed Basil says that the Spirit is from the Father and from nowhere else, he is not speaking properly of the person of the Father himself — lest the Spirit be

understood to have being only from the person of the Father — but simply from the Father, namely from the nature of the Father; so that "from nowhere else" is understood as not from something external, nor from another nature — namely as one of the creatures, as Eunomius said. Since we also accept this exposition of yours, we say that whenever we hear that the Spirit is from the Father or from the Son, we are not compelled on that account to understand that it is from the person of the Father or the Son or from both persons; rather, we can simply understand, hearing "from the Father and from the Son," that it is from their substance — that is, consubstantial with them — and not from some other substance as one of the creatures. For the holy fathers have also said in many places that this must be syllogized. But if it were necessary to understand the Holy Spirit as being from the Father and the Son, it would immediately be understood as from...

PROVINCIAL. From your words I have gathered two things. First, that it is not said in the words of Basil that the Spirit proceeds also from the Son, and this is not compelled. Secondly, that Basil's intention was that the Spirit was not of a nature alien to the nature of the Father himself, and that it is not understood as from the Father but as consubstantial with the essence of the Father and the Son — so that, according to your words, the essence is that which produces the Spirit. Is this what you say?

EPHESIAN. The intention of the great Basil, when he was contending against the heretics who said that the Spirit was alien from the person of the Father and the Son, was not to show from whence it proceeds — since it was not Basil's intention to show from which person the Spirit had its essence; for even the heretics themselves conceded that the Spirit has its cause from God, since all things have theirs, nor was it even necessary to show from which person it has its being, for this was certain through the Gospel, when it is said "the Spirit who proceeds from the Father." But Basil's intention was to show that the Holy Spirit is from God, not as some other creature, but as produced from the substance as the Son. And therefore, when he says "from himself the Spirit," he understands it as from his substance, not from something external.

PROVINCIAL. You say that Basil's intention is to show that the Spirit is of the same nature as the Father and the Son and not of another, as the heretics said. Secondly, that Basil did not intend to deal with the cause of the Spirit, whether it

was the Father or the Son. Thirdly, that Basil's intention is that the Spirit is from the substance of the Father and not from another external substance. These are what you said.

On the first point: As to the first, we agree that Basil strives to show that the Spirit is not of a different nature from the Father and the Son, as the heretics said, and in this we concede.

On the second point: As to the ii, in which you say that it was not his intention to speak of the cause — whether the Spirit is caused by the Father and the Son — to this I say that the contrary of what you said follows from this. For you said: "from nowhere else," that is, "from no other person." Now to say that this person is not from another person is to deal with causality. Secondly, because it is said in the text that the Spirit is from the mouth of God, I then ask whether he understands it as from the mouth of God, that is, the Father, or from the mouth of God, that is, the Son. Whichever way you answer, it is necessary to say that he is speaking of the cause of the Holy Spirit, that is, of its principle.

On the third point: As to the iii, we concede that the Spirit is from the substance of the Father; and because the substance of the Father and of the Son is the same in the same way, it is impossible or even inconceivable that it should be from the substance of the Father without being from the substance of the Son. And just as the Spirit receives from the substance of the Father from the Father, so it is necessarily the case that it receives from what belongs to the Son, from the substance of the Son. Speak to the ii and iii, since on the first we are in agreement.

EPHESIAN. When I accepted your exposition, I did not say that I contradicted myself, but I spoke against you, because you fall and entangle yourself so manifestly in contradiction, before these distinguished men present. For when you were asked by me yesterday whether, when we hear that the Spirit is from the Father, we must necessarily understand it as being from the person of the Father, you said yes. Then, concerning Basil's authority — since Basil himself says "from the Father himself, from nowhere else" — I therefore compelled you, according to your own concession, to concede that the Spirit is from the person of the Father alone and not from another. What I said yesterday followed from your own concessions.

Afterward, entering upon the exposition of another authority — that the phrase "from the Father himself" does not compel us to understand it as from the person of the Father, but that we can understand "from the Father" as meaning from the substance of the Father and not from an alien substance — I brought you to accept this exposition of yours. Following your intention and sense, we said both things and from what you said we gather what necessarily follows. But we were not contradicting ourselves, as you say with this exposition of yours. Rather we say: when we hear that the Spirit is from the Father and from the Son and from both, we are not compelled to understand it as from the persons, but we understand it as from their substance — that is, consubstantial with them. In this way we can say it is from both and from the substance of each on account of the identity of substance, but not from both persons. Even in sacred scripture it is said of Esau to Jacob: "He is your brother and is of your nature"; it is clear that a brother is not from his brother's person, but simply from the nature of his brother as of the same nature and consubstantial. And if it pleases your paternity, I will address the ii chapter, as your paternity has said.

PROVINCIAL. It is good that you hear what I said in the other congregation, declaring how the Spirit is from the person and substance of the person; the entire assembly of the most reverend fathers understood well enough, and whether it could be inferred from that authority that the Spirit is not from another person was also evident to all. And therefore, lest we spend time on superfluous things, I say only to the main point: that the Holy Spirit will perhaps grant harmony between us. Whether it came from my words or from the words of Basil, let us set aside; we are quite content with what is most true, which you said to me — namely, that in this chapter Basil said "from nowhere else," that is, "not from another substance." And if this is Basil's intention, this authority was in no way working against what I said, and therefore it pleases me that you come to the iii. For giving the sense of the word "from nowhere else," you said "not from another substance than from the substance of the Father." Is that so?

EPHESIAN. Yes.

PROVINCIAL. And on this account I say that the authority was not working against me. Speak to the iii, where I was saying that one could not say "from the substance of the Father" without saying "from the substance of the Son," inferring

thus: just as it receives from what belongs to the Father, from the Father, so from what belongs to the Son, from the Son — since the substance of the Father and of the Son is the same.

EPHESIAN. You said that the Holy Spirit, being said to be from the substance of the Father, compels us to understand the same Spirit as being from the substance of the Son, since there is one and the same substance numerically of the Father and the Son; therefore you say that the substance of the Father and Son is the cause of the Spirit.

PROVINCIAL. You are not replying correctly.

EPHESIAN. If when we hear that the Spirit is from the substance of the Father and the Son, should we understand that the Father and the Son have a cause?

PROVINCIAL. Of necessity we are compelled to say that it has its essence from the Father and the Son. If you use the word "cause" in place of "principle," do as you wish; our theologians do not use it. But since Basil here says "from the mouth of God," I ask whether we understand it as from the mouth of the God who is the Father, or from the mouth of the God who is the Son; because whichever way you say it, the same follows. It has already been said that the Gospel says that the Holy Spirit is from the Father, and we understand that it is from the substance of the Father, and that "proceeding from the Father" is to receive being. By what was said before, the argument now stands: just as it receives from what belongs to the Father, from the Father, therefore from what belongs to the Son, from the Son — since the substance of the Father and Son is the same. The example you adduce does nothing for the purpose; after you speak, I will show it.

EPHESIAN. What the blessed Basil said, and what lies in the Gospel, must now be set aside; but answer me this clearly and plainly. When we hear that the Spirit is from the substance of the Father and the Son, must we of necessity understand that the Spirit has the cause of its being from the substance of the Father and the Son?

PROVINCIAL. Actions among human things belong to supposita. I ask whether this is true.

EPHESIAN. You must answer first, and I will answer. I say that it belongs to supposita.

PROVINCIAL. I explained previously that it is not possible in divine things that substance generates, because acts belong to supposita; it follows therefore that the cause of the being of the Spirit itself is the person, not the essence. And because the person of the Father, by generating the Son, communicates his entire substance to the Son, this is the reason why the doctors say that the Son is from the substance of the Father and the Spirit from the substance of the Father and Son — to preserve the unity of essence and the distinction of persons, since the persons are one where there is no relative opposition. And thus you have the understanding of that proposition. Let us stand by the saying of Basil, when he says it is from the mouth of God. Is it from the mouth of the God who is the Father, or from the mouth of the God who is the Son?

EPHESIAN. I cannot accept the conclusions of what you have said, because they seem mutually contradictory; for sometimes you say the Spirit is from the substance of the Father and of the Son, which is numerically one, and now you change the teaching of the doctors and say that the substance does not generate, but through the mediation of the person.

PROVINCIAL. I never said "through the mediation of the person." Let the interpreter say what I say.

ANDREAS. Because the interpreter was not expounding correctly, the Bishop of Colocsa spoke in Greek. He then said: Because of the equivocation, you two cannot agree in the common theology of the Latins and Greeks. It is different to say "the divine essence" and "the essence of the Father and the Son." Do not understand a real difference, but only a difference of reason. When therefore we hear the doctors speaking of the divine essence, we understand what is common to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; when we say the substance or first essence, we understand the person of the Father.

EPHESIAN. Sometimes, but not always.

BISHOP OF COLOCSA. We have doctors who say that the essence of the Father is understood as the person of the Father.

EMPEROR. It does not seem to our serenity that one can respond to two things that are especially different from each other.

CARDINAL. These two fathers spoke in order to clarify the words, but there was no difference.

PROVINCIAL. We say that Isaac, as a suppositum, begat Jacob from his own person; now the nature of Isaac is not that which begat Jacob, but the nature of Isaac is the principle by which he produces that son, and it is the same thing that is communicated. Now I say that Jacob is from the nature of Isaac — this cannot be understood in any other way — that is, from Isaac, that is, from the suppositum of the agent, because actions belong to supposita, and from the nature of Isaac as from the principle, which is communication. Now if it were possible that the nature of Isaac and Jacob were the same, though they are numerically two, the example would be a good one.

On generation in divine things: Now because generation in divine things is of infinite perfection, we say this: because the Father — which is the name of the hypostasis and subsistence — this suppositum is what generates, because generating is a notional act and belongs only to a suppositum. Now the substance of the Father is the principle by which the Father generates and it is that which is given to the Son and communicated to the Son through generation, and it is that which is received from the Son and communicated to the Son — just as in human things the nature of Isaac is what is received from Jacob the generated suppositum and communicated to him. But the difference is because of the excellence: because in the Father and Son and Spirit it is numerically one, and thus they are distinguished in nothing except that the Father is the Father and the Son is the Son. And we say that wisdom, goodness, and all else are communicated together with this substance. Now because essence is an abstract name signifying essence, not the suppositum, the act of generation cannot belong to it; and because it is numerically one, if it were to generate, there would have to be a distinction of essence and nature in divine things, because the same does not generate itself, but must generate another. Therefore it is concluded that in divine things essence neither generates nor is generated.

When it is asked how the Spirit is from the substance of the Father and the Son, I say that it is from the substance of the Father, which is communicated. Now for the sake of truth — since my only aim is that the truth be had — speak to that word "from the mouth," about which I asked.

EPHESIAN. I gathered from your words that the substance of the Father and the Son, since it is numerically one, is the principle of the Holy Spirit; for you are accustomed to prefer this. But when the Father and the Son produce the Holy Spirit, they produce him through the common substance. Now since, when you hear that the Spirit is from the Father and the Son, you necessarily understand a cause of the Spirit — is it not true to say that both substance and person are the cause of the Spirit?

PROVINCIAL. There is the "principle by which" (*quo*) and "the principle which" (*quod*).

EPHESIAN. In whatever manner, let the substance of the Father and Son be the principle of the Spirit as the "principle by which." It remains therefore that the substance of the Spirit is principiated.

PROVINCIAL. It does not follow. You do not understand from a common principle from a communicating thing, one and the same thing.

ANDREAS. A mutual discussion took place between the deputies on both sides.

EPHESIAN. I say: if the common substance of the Father and the Son, which is one and the same numerically, produces the Spirit — ?

PROVINCIAL. You are not speaking correctly.

EPHESIAN. I say: if the substance, which is common to the Father and the Son and one, what prevents the procession of the Spirit from being caused?

PROVINCIAL. ...carefully handed on his teaching, drawing out the subscriptions of his fellow priests." Now if all the fathers of the Council of Chalcedon gave such great testimonies in the matter of the Spirit, and he himself says so clearly in this passage, it seems necessarily the case that both yours and ours must follow his teaching in a matter of faith. Here is the most ancient text in Greek; if you wish to

hear it, you can do so now; it reads that the Spirit is from the Son, with no mention of essence.

EPHESIAN. The authority of Basil is to be examined, after the proposed matters have been examined.

PROVINCIAL. Say what you think, since this sets forth the whole of our disputation.

EPHESIAN. We will repeat what was said: that the substance of the Father and the Son, which is numerically one, you say is also the cause of the Spirit; because it seems from this that the essence of the Spirit is made, then two substances in the divine Trinity are gathered, which are mutually opposed according to cause and caused. This is far from Christian theology and wholly alien to it, and has not been said by any doctor; for they say: substance neither generates nor produces, nor according to substance does the Father generate or produce or the Son, as you say, but according to his essence, that is, according to his natural property. Therefore the common substance of the Father and the Son is not of itself a cause, neither "that by which" nor "that which"; for neither by itself, nor through itself, is the Spirit generated or produced, but according to its personal and receptive property. These things then are gathered from your words, and you will not be able to amend what has been said either now or at another time. Now let us proceed to the authority.

PROVINCIAL. You say that it seems to follow from my words that the divine essence is caused, but I hold that the essence...

EPHESIAN. I do not say that the divine substance is caused, but that it is divided.

On the two meanings of "substance":

PROVINCIAL. Attend to the interpretation. "Substance" is sometimes taken for what is expressed by the definition of a thing, as we say: the definition indicates what the being of a thing is, and this is quiddity, essence, or nature; and in its signification it does not connote the suppositum, but always signifies that form or essence or nature. In another way "substance" is taken — and you have this in V of the *Metaphysics* in the chapter on substance, and our doctors make this distinction — ii: substance is taken for the suppositum, which stands under the higher species,

just as we say that in the line of substance or predicamental substance, as Porphyry sets out, this man Socrates and Plato are placed, and these are supposita and are called substance. This substance, which is thus a suppositum, is sometimes called hypostasis, sometimes subsistence, sometimes the thing of nature. But in human nature it is further called person, because it is the incommunicable subsistence of an intellectual nature. So that in an intellectual species, what in other species is called suppositum and substance and subsistence or thing of nature, is called an intellectual person.

On Arius and Macedonius: This being established — because the holy doctors, wishing to press against Arius and Macedonius, of whom the first said the Son is a creature, not of the substance of the Father, and the ii said the Spirit is a creature — they used this manner of speaking very widely, that the Son is from the essence of the Father, and that the Spirit is from the essence and substance of the Father and the Son.

If we take substance for subsistence, since the Father, being in intellectual nature as a person, can thus be called subsistence, and substance, thing of nature, and suppositum — if taken in this way, it is the same to say that generating belongs to the person of the Father as if one were to say: it belongs to this substance, because this substance, which is the same as the Father, and that paternity is what generates, and is in no way communicated. Why? Because the properties are not communicable.

All our Latin doctors do not use the term "substance" for the person of the Father or the person of the Holy Spirit, but they have retained the name of substance according to the way it is expressed here by definition — which in human things is called essence or nature. When we say, according to our Latins, that the Spirit is from the substance of the Father, we take substance for the essence which is in the Father.

Now I distinguished substance in two ways. Substance is sometimes taken for the suppositum, and then it is the same as person in divine things, and it is the same as subsistence and hypostasis, when we speak of substance. When we say: the Spirit is from the substance of the Father — Latin doctors never take substance as subsistence or as suppositum or person, because person is not communicated, nor

is subsistence or suppositum communicated. I say that substance is taken in another way, and this according to philosophers and theologians, as we say that the definition indicates the substance of a thing, and this is quiddity — it is called nature and essence. When our doctors say that the Spirit is from the substance of the Father or of the Son, they do not take substance as the subsistence of the Father, but take the person for that nature. Therefore that essence is in the Father and is really the same as the Father, and the name "Father" says both essence and the relation according to which this suppositum is distinguished from another. This common essence is in the Father, and this is what is communicated to the Son through generation; and this is the principle by which the Father generates and produces the Son. But this essence is not communicated to the Son according to the being it has in the Father, and here is where your error lies — because you do not understand why, when we say that the essence of the Father is communicated in the Son, we do not say it according to the being it has in the Father, because it would follow that it would generate, which would be impossible.

This essence in itself, as the potency of generating, is the "principle by which," and it is that which is communicated and given by the Father to the Son himself — but not according to absolute being. Now in the generation of the Father with respect to the Son, all things are communicated together with the essence that are in the Father, except the being of paternity or property, because this is not communicated. Being the principle of the Spirit does not conflict with filiation; being the principle of the Holy Spirit — because it is the principle of the Spirit in the Father — does not conflict with the filiation or property of the Son. Thus it does not follow that the Spirit is in any way caused or causes. In this way all Latin doctors give this understanding and explain those locutions in which it is said that the Son is from the substance of the Father or the Son. Hold the understanding of substance in this way and distinctly, and you will not be in equivocation.

ANDREAS. Here the authority of Basil was read in Greek.

CARDINAL. Since the lord Provincial has responded to your question, you should respond to the iii authority of Basil.

EPHESIAN. When we hear the fathers of the first synod saying in the first creed — in the theology concerning the Son — that the Son is begotten from the Father

from the substance of the Father, we understand nothing else but from his person, that is, from substance together with properties. Does it please you that substance is called person, and is substance said in another way to be distinct, or is another form of substance given to you?

PROVINCIAL. I have said it many times; you do not grasp it. You heard that we understand the name "substance" according to two ways — namely one way, when we wish to show the common substance of the three persons. But the other way, when we speak of the substance together with those properties which are in them — that is, the person. But when in the creed of the first council it is said "begotten from the Father, that is, from the substance of the Father," we must of all necessity understand: from the person of the Father — from no other species of substance than from these two. I say that in divine things the doctors use only these two ways. But this first mode among Latins was never admitted except under the name of subsistence or hypostasis or person, lest anyone might calumniate us for positing three substances; rather, they took substance in the first mode, as was concluded at the Council of Nicaea, when it was defined that the Son was *homoousios* with the Father. When we say "consubstantial," that consubstantiality is the one common to the three persons, and all propositions are understood of this — they are "from the substance of the Father" as from the principle through which it is generated.

EPHESIAN. You said that the substance according to which the Father and Son are one is the same as that which is common to the three persons.

PROVINCIAL. Yes.

EPHESIAN. See whether it is true to say that from the common substance of the three persons the Spirit proceeds personally; for you said previously that the Spirit proceeds from the common substance of the Father and the Son.

PROVINCIAL. I would wish you to better understand this proposition concerning property and essence. Do you make some distinction between property and this essence?

EPHESIAN. The greatest.

PROVINCIAL. What is it — real or according to reason?

EPHESIAN. The distinction of persons is seen according to our reason; the distinction is seen according to reason in the persons — not in relation to one another, but in relation to the substance of each suppositum or of the persons. Each person is distinguished from its substance by reason. The persons in divine things are distinguished, lest the persons themselves subsist by themselves.

PROVINCIAL. By their quiddity these properties are the same as the person — namely, paternity and the Father.

EPHESIAN. According to the thing or suppositum they are the same, but they are distinguished by reason.

PROVINCIAL. Now in the person of the Father there is paternity and the essence common to the three; therefore the person of the Father is distinguished from paternity and essence only by reason. Is this so?

EPHESIAN. Yes.

PROVINCIAL. And they are distinguished from others really. Well said. Since therefore in the Father there is nothing but paternity, how does the Father generate? What is it that is communicated to the Son? Is it paternity, or essence, or both?

EPHESIAN. What is communicated to the Son is the substance or essence; it is not communicated to the Son according to the substance itself, but according to its paternal property — for this is the principle of the being of the Son, not the substance itself which is common to the three.

PROVINCIAL. What is communicated to the Son is the substance, and that which is common to the three — because in the person of the Father there is nothing but this essence and paternity, nothing more. If therefore what is communicated is not the property, not the suppositum — and substance in the *ii* mode and suppositum are the same — it follows of necessity that if the Father communicates something to the Son, he communicates nothing but this common essence.

EPHESIAN. This is what we said — that the substance common to the three is what the Father communicates to the Son, which, since it is numerically one, is not divided.

PROVINCIAL. The word "divide" does not belong in divine things. Speak.

EPHESIAN. Since it is numerically one, it is divided according to our reason in the Father, the Son, and the substance of the Holy Spirit. As we understand by the distinction of these names the person of each, what is it that you conclude?

PROVINCIAL. What I conclude from these things, I conclude one thing which is contrary to what you say — that this essence is divided in the three persons — which is false, because the essence of the Father, which is communicated to the Son and the Spirit, would be communicated only according to reason. This is false and against the doctors, who say: it is really communicated. And since each person has being only through essence and reason, it would follow that they are distinct only according to reason.

EPHESIAN. I did not say that the persons are distinct according to reason, but when we understand the property together with the substance, we distinguish each person and say the substance of the Son is from the substance of the Father — by which we wish to show that the person of the Son is from the substance of the Father. And thus we subsist the divine persons having their properties — not that the persons themselves are distinguished from one another according to reason.

PROVINCIAL. You say that the communication of essence would be according to reason.

EPHESIAN. I did not say so, but that it is distinguished by reason in the three persons; this happens with us — we do not ask this of you in quite the same way — how do you understand it: the substance of the Father and the substance of the Son, do you understand them as distinct?

PROVINCIAL. I said that our Latin doctors take substance in divine things for essence, not for subsistence, and therefore we never say there are three substances, although we say there are three subsisting things and three hypostases and persons really distinct; but in this essence there is one thing, and one God. The person is constituted from the divine essence and from the property, and therefore there is nothing more in the person than essence and property; and these two — property and essence — are one according to the thing, but according to the property of the person they are distinguished really, because they are relational (*ad aliquid*), and

according to essence they are one. And there is one God, and this essence is communicated.

ANDREAS. For another day, with the minds of the audience constrained by the pressure of affairs, the matter was deferred, at the wish of the Greeks.

Die viii Martii — On the eighth of March, in the iii assembly at Florence, the Ephesian gave the following beginning to the contention.

EPHESIAN. Yesterday, reverend father, we set aside the ii authority of Basil cited by you. Therefore it seems right that that authority be read, if it please you, so that both of us may consider it.

ANDREAS. The authority was read in Greek, then in Latin in this manner: "For what necessity is there, if the Spirit is iii in dignity or order, that it be ii in dignity or order from the Son..." was corrupted. The same blessed Cyril, writing to Acacius in the letter "Mutual discourse truly," says at the end: "But if a letter as if written by me is produced by some, saying that we repented of what we did at Ephesus, let it be ridiculed" — and this: "for we are, by the grace of God, in sound mind, and we are not carried beyond right reason." From these words it is manifestly clear that Cyril always held the same opinion which he had held at the iii synod. And in that same letter he introduces Messenius the bishop, who had brought to Cyril that corrupted letter of Athanasius to Epictetus, and was asking Cyril whether he was of the same faith as Athanasius; and the blessed Cyril responded thus: "If you have the letter of Athanasius to Epictetus whole and uncorrupted, I am of the same faith as Athanasius." They examined this letter together with the one he had with him, and it appeared to be different; and throughout the whole East no whole letter of Athanasius was found except with Cyril. Hence that Messenius corrected his copy to the example of the one held by Cyril, and sent the corrected version to John of Antioch.

On the corruption of books by the early schismatics: Now it does not seem unreasonable that, while our present dissension stands, those earlier ones — who are to be blamed more than those who came later — seizing the occasion of divisions from this part concerning the procession, which had always been from the beginning of our faith until that hour, in order to remove what Basil sets down,

had corrupted the books of which you speak. Hence it is credibly believed that the Holy Spirit preserved this book in the city of Constantinople so that it would not be found by them. Wherefore from what has been said, no reason follows that there is here a deceit of addition. Furthermore, since you and we have come together to see the truth from mutual charity, in holy intention we must share books with one another; and since this matter is of great weight, if anyone among you has a most ancient book of Basil, let all your copies be produced, and let them be brought alongside this one. Secondly, let what follows be examined, so that from what precedes and follows it may be concluded that he truly intended this. These are the things we have for now.

CARDINAL. Let the passage be read as it is in your book, and let our book and yours on paper be shown.

EPHESIAN. Very well.

ANDREAS. In the meantime the books were shown to the Emperor by both sides.

EPHESIAN. That a similar book is found with us having the addition, as you also produced and as we professed. Therefore it is not to be wondered at if this book came from among those books that were found in Constantinople. It seems therefore rather that we did not make such an addition to this; for if we had made it, we could easily have deleted all the books found in Constantinople, since there are few books and those that have this addition. For if we had been the ones who made this change, since the books are very few, we could most easily have deleted them. But since we have used simplicity, we allowed the books to stand in which there was a contrary opinion. By whom can it be said that this was carried over from them? It is also plausible that this book was written by someone who was in those regions and held that opinion; and in this way it is not to be wondered at, since it is plausible that in those regions too there were some who held our opinion.

On the broader phenomenon of book corruption: Now that corruption was often made in those regions by certain heretics who were introducing new opinions into the Church, we assent to this and have the authorities which you produce, who say what you say. But among you it is well known that under Pope Zosimus the acts of the Council of Nicaea were produced at the Council of Carthage. For that

pope wrote to that council that the Council of Nicaea, in its canons, gave the authority of the apostles and the primacy of the whole world to the supreme Roman pontiff, citing a certain canon of the Council of Nicaea. Since those who were there did not recognize this canon, they did not receive it so easily, but said: "We have nothing of the sort in the Nicene canons, and therefore we seek authentic copies of the Nicene from the Eastern bishops" — that is, from the blessed Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, and the blessed Sophronius of Constantinople. When these authentic Nicene copies were sought from the said bishops through letters of the council and sent to them, they were found to contain no such canon as the pope produced. Therefore they themselves wrote back that he should no longer seek apostolic authority for this, since it had not been transmitted through the canon of the councils. You see how that pope produced a falsified canon — especially since he wrote to such a great council on so great a matter. Therefore it is not to be wondered at if among us certain people corrupted books, wishing to innovate dogmas and lean upon their authorities.

And in this authority of Basil, the multitude and antiquity of books give the victory to our book; and this very fact that the traveling books were seen and were not deleted — though it was possible on account of their fewness — shows this. But it seems that, trusting in the truth and in the other words of our father Basil, we allowed this addition to stand in books of this kind, as they stand.

PROVINCIAL. Read as you have it.

ANDREAS rose reading and said: "That he himself does not think that one ought to remain in the simple and rude faith of the many, but by certain artificial and sophistical arguments to deceive the truth again toward what seems right to him — he showed well enough from what he said. For when he scorned the opinions of the many, who perceive the Holy Spirit to be known from the teaching of the saints, and keeps silent about those who handed this on to him — he now keeps silent about what he showed he had done in the discourses on the Only-begotten: saying that he learned from the saints that it is *iii* in dignity and order, and believed of himself that it is *iii* in nature. But who the saints are, and in what discourses they said it, you cannot say. Is it then the case that from this novelty you deny the dogmas that come from divine things, teaching this?" — Is this how your book has it?

PROVINCIAL. Yes. Thus Basil here, meeting Eunomius, showed sufficiently from what he said that he himself does not wish to persevere in the simple and rude faith of the many, but deceives... Read those words, beginning: "For what necessity..."

ANDREAS continued reading: "For what necessity is there, if the Spirit is iii in dignity, that it also be iii in nature? For just as it is ii in being from the Son in dignity — perhaps the discourse of piety allows this — but that it be iii in nature, we have not been taught by holy scriptures, nor is it possible by valid consequence to syllogize or gather it from what was said above; for just as the Son is second in order from the Father because from him and in dignity because the Father is the principle and cause of his being, and because through him there is progress toward God the Father — he is not second in nature, because the divinity in both is one — let it be clear that the Holy Spirit, even if it succeeds the Son in dignity and order, and so this opinion — let us concede — not plausibly, as if to be of an alien nature."

EPHESIAN. In this section, since Basil first reproached Eunomius as an innovator and as bold, because he attributed to the saints things not said by them, he afterward concedes by way of supposition that the Holy Spirit is iii in order and dignity, but not from this as by necessity iii in nature. He does not afterward infer this as a consequence. The firm position or resistance — in which he disproves Eunomius saying he guards the teaching of the saints, "scorning the opinion of the many by whom the Holy Spirit is perceived" — "who the saints are and in what discourses they said it, never did he confess — so bold a man is he, who is an innovator of divine dogmas." In these things Basil seems clearly in no way to accept or regard it as the teaching of the saints that the Spirit is iii in dignity and order. Afterward, having conceded this by supposition, he infers thus: "What necessity is there, if the Spirit is iii in dignity and order, that it be iii in nature? Its very divinity, being ii from the Son, subjoins the discourse of piety." Our book has it thus. Since this book is most ancient as you see, and the things said are consonant, and since he entirely refused to accept that the Spirit being iii in order and dignity is to be considered as the teaching of the saints, but gave it by supposition — how could Basil have said this and given by concession that the Spirit is ii from the Son, and entirely denied it of himself and regarded it as alien

from the teaching of the saints, if he thought that the Holy Spirit has being from the Son?

On Basil's letter to Gregory: But that Basil held this opinion in no way and did not think the Spirit proceeds from the Son and receives being from him, our witness is none other than Basil himself, writing thus in the letter he writes to his brother Gregory on the difference of essence and person. From the authority that is to be read, Basil's intention and what opinion he held about the procession of the Spirit will be clearly discerned. For he says thus in the letter: "Since the Holy Spirit, from whom the gift of goods for every creature flows, depends from the Son, with whom he is contemplated without distinction, and depending from the cause of the Father has being — from whence also he proceeds. This notional thing he has according to the property of the person: that he is after the Son, that he is known together with him, and that he subsists from the Father. But the Son, who shows the Spirit that proceeds from the Father through himself and with himself, alone the only-begotten from the ungenerated, the shining light, has no communication according to the property of notions from the Father to the Spirit, but only that which is indicated by signs."

In this plain authority of Basil, he says that the Spirit has being from the Father alone. For he says thus: "The Holy Spirit depends from the Son" — that is, is ordered after the Son. Afterward, giving the reason, he does not say that it proceeds from the Son or has being from him, as the very authority produced by you says, but "is comprehended together with him without distinction, since it proceeds from the Father." And he subjoins with a partial figure, dividing the discourse: "depending from the cause, has being — from whence also he proceeds." Do you see how he gives the cause of the Spirit to the Father alone — that depending, the Spirit has its being? Never in this authority would the saint have said things contrary to himself. For reason does not permit this to be attributed to the Son; the notional sign is given to him — that he is comprehended together with him without distinction. And he subjoins: "the Son, not the Spirit proceeding from the Father, indicates through himself and with himself and manifests" — he does not say that the Son produces what proceeds from the Father, but that he denotes it through himself and with himself manifests it. Then he said that the ungenerated Son from the ungenerated Father shines, saying the Son has no communion according to the

property of men from the Father or from the Spirit; therefore no thing communicated does he have from the production of the Spirit, which he attributes to the person of the Father alone — he says it is known only by these and not by others, because alone in the grace... from the Father, because through himself and with himself he marks the Holy Spirit. Therefore by these alone it is shown and known and not by others; therefore he communicates the production of the Spirit, which he attributes to the Father alone.

PROVINCIAL. Many things have been said by the reverend father, which could perhaps have been expressed more briefly, because if we wish to come to the truth of the matter — since truth is content with few things — our speeches ought to be nothing but the sentences and testimonies of the fathers. And so I respond briefly to what was said, to the two things you put forward to undermine the authority. I say thus. Since you yourself said

On the book produced and whether it could have been corrupted: ...that the book produced before the assembly could have been corrupted by someone present there who held our opinion. This is rejected as follows. Because at the time when the book was written — as is clearly apparent from its inspection — at that time there was no division between the Latins and the Greeks, and this seems a sufficiently evident conjecture. Secondly, because I did not say that the fathers who are in the present time, or those a little before us, ought to have corrupted the books; rather, we speak of the authors of this division, who, when they saw that the Greek and Latin doctors held this opinion — as will be clearly shown from your books — found no better way to give color to their position than by falsifying the books they could get hold of.

On the ii point — Pope Zosimus and the Council of Carthage: As to the ii, I say thus: you cited Pope Zosimus and said that he sent certain Nicene canons to the Council of Carthage, wishing to infer that Zosimus sent a corrupted canon and that Zosimus committed this falsification. You cited no doctor who says this is authentic. I cited to you two great testimonies in two letters of the blessed Cyril, one of which was accepted by the entire Council of Chalcedon. Whoever wishes to attack such things ought not to speak from himself, but must bring forward the authority of a great doctor.

You should well remember that the reverend lord Cardinal produced authentic and most ancient witnesses — the letter of the holy Pope Julius, and the letter of Pope Liberius — and how the blessed Athanasius, in that persecution he endured from the Council of Antioch where he was condemned, writing to the holy popes Marcus, Felix, Julius, and Liberius, who all lived in his time, he supplicated these pontiffs — since they had the acts of the Council of Nicaea in the Roman see, because throughout the entire East they had been corrupted by the Arians — and those pontiffs wrote back to Athanasius how they had in the Roman patriarchate the complete acts in Greek and Latin with the seals and subscriptions of the fathers who were at Nicaea, and that they preserved them with the greatest veneration, and that they did not wish to send the originals, but that they should send certain chapters, because he had appealed from that council to the Roman see. And the Arians rose up against him, saying that he could not appeal from the sentence of the Council of Antioch to the pope. And so that he might be able to show through the Nicene canons that by virtue of those canons he had appealed well and rightly, Liberius sent many canons to Athanasius, which were announced to you at Ferrara, in a letter — among which there is a special canon that the whole world is to appeal to the Roman see — and thus Athanasius was defended.

And therefore the holy Pope Julius, responding to those from Antioch who had held a council, reproved them very sharply for the presumption of holding a council without the consent of the apostolic see, showing from the Council of Nicaea that no council is or ever will be valid that has not been confirmed by the authority of the Roman see. How can they say that Liberius falsified something in a matter that is clear? I say that those Carthaginians, because they knew that the canons had been corrupted throughout the whole East, and since they were sent according to this canon and were thus corrupted copies that were sent — and since these are the testimonies of the saints, and we can produce most ancient books — what you said is to be dismissed with equal ease. As you spoke, so let it stand with these authorities, because in such a case it is necessary to speak more by testimonies. Now to this part I say thus: from the words you produced, and expounding the words of Basil, it is no wonder if many incongruities appear in what you said, because you founded your exposition upon a corrupted text; and as the philosopher says, a small error at the beginning is great at the end — it is no wonder that many incongruous things were said.

On the two key points from Basil, and the order of the Spirit: And therefore, for the understanding of truth — which is good — let us restrict ourselves to two things. First, you said: the Spirit depends from the Son, but nonetheless the Son is not the cause of the Spirit, but the Father. Secondly, you seemed to say that the Spirit does not have such an order and nature from the Son as the Son has from the Father. Therefore here I will say certain things. And first I ask you: what do you understand by "to depend" and "to be"? Nevertheless, because "to be a cause" and "to depend from it" differ — since with us being always depends on a cause — in divine things no effect is posited, nothing principiated, because neither do we Latins say this, nor do we find the Greeks doing so. We say in divine things: because the principle is a principle from a principle — as God from God — so the Father is a principle; and according to Basil's manner of speaking, not only in this cited passage but in many others as we will show, he shows that the Spirit is related to the Son in the same way as the Son depends from the Son as the Son from the Father; as Basil himself says, that the Son depends from the Father — let him declare the difference in divine things between "to depend" and "to be a cause."

ANDREAS. Here he wished to respond to everything, and the Provincial said: the faculty of replying will be given.

EMPEROR. The Ephesian wishes to speak about certain first things, but the last questions asked are not pertinent.

CARDINAL. We agreed that one should respond only to the question asked.

EMPEROR. Because through this father you said we spoke without authority, I wish to give testimony.

PROVINCIAL. Let the testimony be given.

EPHESIAN. We did not adduce the testimony — not because we could not; for we hold that testimony from books that are with us. We brought few books, but that book is found among you, and we believe it would be known among you.

PROVINCIAL. What is that book called?

EPHESIAN. The Book of Canons.

PROVINCIAL. It will never be found that Zosimus committed a fraud.

POPE. Respond to the question, and the book will be produced at another assembly.

EPHESIAN. So that you may understand first in what "being the cause of something" and "something depending from it" differ: we say that the blessed Basil, wishing to explain what he means by "depending," says: "to depend — that is, to be ordered together with him and to be comprehended together with him."

CARDINAL. Does it say "after" or "together with him"?

EPHESIAN. Things that are counted together cannot be uttered in one voice, but it is necessary that they be ordered in person, that one be ordered before another. But the Spirit is ordered after the Son — this is how it must be; not that it has its cause from him. Basil did not say this, but rather: "depends — ordered with him, similarly ordered together with him." This is what Basil says. But where did you find this exposition, that everything which depends from another has its being from it?

PROVINCIAL. In divine things.

EPHESIAN. For this authority we need no interpreter other than the one who said it, who gave the reason for the depending — because "it is comprehended together with him without distinction."

PROVINCIAL. Therefore "to depend," according to Basil and according to your exposition, is nothing other than that the Spirit is ordered in relation to the Son. What is this order of the Holy Spirit to the Son? Is it an order of origin, or also according to cause — a causal order? Tell me, if it is an order of origin.

EPHESIAN. I do not say that the Spirit is ordered in relation to the Son, but after the Son — as in a counting, preserving the order; and since it is necessary, after the Father the Son, after the Son the Spirit.

PROVINCIAL. It is nothing other than an order according to counting by voice, so that apart from the name there is no order of the Spirit to the Son. Is that so?

EPHESIAN. There is indeed also a necessity even according to our speech to order the divine persons; for in no way could they be numbered without preserving the order. There is an order according to the nature of the thing, as Basil says — that the Son, the only-begotten, shining from the ungenerated Father, ought to be numbered after him as only-begotten from the Father; and according to this reason the Spirit ought to be called third, lest the Spirit be placed before the Son and referred proximately to the Father, and appear to be another Son. Therefore, since the Son is numbered the closest after the Father, the Spirit is numbered third. This is the order in divine things; we have no other order from the theologians.

PROVINCIAL. You say from Basil's intention: that is the order of nature of the Spirit to the Son; one must therefore understand an order of nature between the Father and the Son. Is there another order than the order of nature between the Holy Spirit and the Son? Because the order of nature of the Spirit to the Son, according to you, is an ordering — yet it does not imply a cause. But when between the Son and the Father it signifies nothing but dependence — since in saying "between the Son and the Father there is an order of nature," the Son is understood to depend from the Father and the Father to be the cause — so, having nothing more with respect to the order of the Son, and speaking only of the Spirit, saying there is an order of nature, it necessarily follows that the Spirit proceeds from the Son, and that he is the cause. And I prove this from Basil's own intention; for he says, after those words that were cited in our book, continuing the intention throughout the whole chapter, beginning to assign the cause of why the Spirit, being third in the order and dignity of the Trinity, is *ii* from the Son and yet has one nature with him, he shows it thus, assigning the cause: "As the Son is *ii* in order from the Father — because from him, and through him having access and approach to the Father and God — he is not therefore *ii* in nature, because the divinity in both is one; so the Spirit, although it is ordered *ii* in dignity and order from the Son, it does not therefore rightly follow that it is of an alien nature." Now in this text, wishing to show what he first said, he demonstrates that such as is the order of the Son to the Father — through this, that the Father is before and the cause of the Son, and there is only one nature — the Spirit has the same order to the Son. These things are clear from Basil, and he deduces them by irrefutable examples against Eunomius; and this is the meaning of the entire chapter of Basil. He says that all angels are of one nature, in the same intellectual nature, and yet he posits an order

among them and dignity, citing many texts of scripture through which he shows the grades of angels and dignities; and he concludes that if all angels have an order among themselves, it does not follow that any angel is of a different nature, because as they are ordered, they always remain in the same nature.

EPHESIAN. There is indeed a natural order between the Father and the Son, according to which the Son has being from the Father and is referred proximately to him; and this order alone compels the Spirit to be numbered third. For this reason the great Basil in no way posits that "depending" applies between the Father and the Son — he does not say that the Son depends from the Father — but says that the Son is *ii* because from him he has being. Of the Spirit, he says it depends from the Son — that is, it is continuous with and ordered together with him; and he gives this as the reason why it depends from the Son: because of necessity the Son is understood before the Spirit, since the Son is referred continuously to the Father. But truly, if Basil had recognized the order between the Son and the Spirit as between the Father and the Son, he would have said thus: the Spirit is *ii* from the Son as the Son is *ii* from the Father; he would not have pressed Eunomius down nor called him an innovator of scripture for saying the Spirit is third in order and dignity. It is established that Basil did not accept this, but posits it by way of supposition.

PROVINCIAL. You speak against the text. You said, as it stands, that between the Spirit and the Son there is an order of nature, and that this "depending" is an order of nature. We press on this point; reflect on this when you leave here, because we have shown from this book that the same order which the Son has from the Father, the Spirit has toward the Son. And I wish to say one thing philosophically to the Emperor, so that he may understand me.

ANDREAS. He wished to address words to the Emperor, who is most learned and is very well known to surpass all his own people in prudence and acuity in many matters; he set forth these words.

On the meaning of "order of nature" from Aristotle: PROVINCIAL. Our theologian doctors always strive not to change terms from their proper signification; and where the philosophers used terms with their proper determination, so the theological doctors use terms as they are firm in their

signification — otherwise all the knowledge of the world would perish, because we would always be in an equivocation of terms. Now Aristotle in the V book of the *Metaphysics*, which is called the book *On Quotients* — where he declares in how many ways the terms of nature are taken — in the chapter that begins: "Nature, where the first mode is the generation of growing things, so that nativity is called nature in one way; the ii mode is that principle from which growing things are, as something inherent in them, and in this mode of taking nature it has the force of carrying the order of origin, as growing things are from the substance of that from which they grow." And with this meaning both the Greek doctors and the Latin ones — such as Athanasius and Basil and the blessed Augustine and those who follow — say that the order of origin of one person to another is the order of nature; and in this sense Basil and all speak, otherwise they would be equivocating. So that the order of origin is nothing other than receiving being from something and its nature, from which it is — as it is taken in that ii mode. And thus all the doctors of the world hold this. If therefore there is an order of nature of the Spirit from the Son, it necessarily follows that the Spirit has being from the Son and receives the same nature that the Son has — and this is what Basil says in the authority adduced. This is the point of our matter.

EPHESIAN. Before we consider more carefully the order of nature, let us first ask what Basil intends by this authority. Tell me: do you say that Basil's opinion is that the Spirit is iii in dignity and order?

PROVINCIAL. Yes, and so the text says.

EPHESIAN. Did Eunomius also say that he had received this from the teaching of the holy fathers?

PROVINCIAL. Yes — Eunomius said that he had received from the scriptures that the Spirit was iii in order and dignity; indeed they agreed on this. But Basil denies that it follows from this that it is iii in nature, and the entire meaning of the chapter runs on this — as will be demonstrated.

EPHESIAN. Eunomius would have been speaking the truth when he said the Spirit is iii in order and dignity, and that he had received this from the saints, and would have agreed with the saints.

PROVINCIAL. Yes, and with Basil.

EPHESIAN. Let us see if the great Basil truly wishes this.

PROVINCIAL. Yes.

EPHESIAN. Similarly Eunomius says he keeps the teaching of the saints.

PROVINCIAL. Our book says that he had from the saints that the Spirit is iii in order and dignity.

EPHESIAN. Does your book not say that Eunomius *pretends* to hold the teaching of the saints?

PROVINCIAL. Basil infers: what necessity is there, if it is iii in order and dignity, that it therefore be of a third nature?

EPHESIAN. Does your book not say: he *pretends*?

PROVINCIAL. Yes — that he was pretending that inference, that it would be third in nature.

EPHESIAN. Does Basil not say this from what Eunomius was gathering, but says that he pretends to keep the teaching of the saints — that the saints say the Spirit is iii in dignity and order?

PROVINCIAL. That pretense refers to the inference, because the saints, saying it is iii in dignity and order, were not making that inference; and therefore the text cited yesterday, after the words of Eunomius, singularly said of that inference: "that it be iii in nature we have not been taught by the holy scriptures, nor can we gather it from what has been said according to consequence." And so Basil spoke against this inference. Even if it were not third in dignity and order, he would have said the same about nature; and that this is most true is gathered most evidently from the examples and deductions.

EPHESIAN. If it had been the opinion of the saints and of Basil himself that the Spirit is iii in order and dignity, he would not have said against Eunomius that he pretended to keep the teaching of the saints — indeed he would have said that he was keeping the teaching of the saints, and would have gathered nothing other than

what was posited. They said it is *iii* in order and dignity; from this he gathers that it is *iii* in nature. Now Basil does not contest the truth of the saying, but says: "he pretends to keep the teaching of the saints."

PROVINCIAL. These are matters of fact.

EPHESIAN. For he subsequently presses his case against the opinion, saying that those who handed on this order to him — he keeps silent about who the saints are and in what discourses. Do you see how Basil denies this to be the opinion of the saints and his own? Afterward he says: "who is this bold man, the innovator of divine dogmas" — indicating and calling him an innovator and bold, because he said he had received from the saints what they had not said. Not one of the saints said it is *iii* in dignity; and in this way Basil speaks, pressing against the reasoning of Eunomius. Otherwise show from the opinions of the saints that this is so; for we have shown that Basil did not agree with it — indeed it was not the opinion of him and of the doctors. Does not the book have it? Let it be examined.

PROVINCIAL. This is a matter of fact regarding the book. Basil does not say that he had this from the saints. I adduce a most singular testimony — namely of the great Athanasius, whose same opinion Cyril says he holds. This most blessed Athanasius, in that dialogue, disputing in council against Arius, also says thus in these words. This is the letter: "The Spirit therefore is from the substance of the Father and Son — namely for this reason: because the Son of God names him in the hallowed creed as third in the creed, where it reads: Go, baptize them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." From this Athanasius, because he is placed in the sanctified creed as the third person, concludes that he is of the substance of the Father and Son, and thus necessarily has substance from the Father and Son.

On the order in Athanasius's first letter to Serapion: Concerning the order, in the first letter to Serapion he says and founds his position upon the authorities of scripture, saying as follows: "from the Son it receives, according to what the Lord says: 'He will receive of mine and will announce to you' [John 16:14]; of the Son he says: 'He came in the name of the Father'; of the Holy Spirit he says: 'whom the Father will send in my name' [John 14:26]." He says: "If the Spirit has such an order and nature toward the Son as the Son has toward the Father — how then

would one who now calls it a creature not also say the same of necessity about the Son?" Now it is said irrefutably, founded on the testimony of holy doctors, that the Spirit has such an order and nature toward the Son as the Son has toward the Father. From these it is gathered that it is the third person, and that such is the order — and from this authority he gathers that the Spirit receives being from the Son. You will declare that the Spirit receives being from the Son. It is not to be believed that Basil contradicts Athanasius; and in the following congregation, if it shall please God, it will be shown from Basil himself that he says the same as the blessed Athanasius.

Die X Martii — On the tenth of March, at Florence, in the assembly as above, the Cardinal began in this manner.

CARDINAL. Lord Emperor, it was said on another occasion that when you needed books from ours, we would supply them, and conversely they would do the same. Yesterday in the disputation there was debate about the words of Basil, and it was said that in our books it stands differently and in theirs differently. We know that one of the Greek fathers has a Basil — we ask that he produce it; and it is the father the lord Archbishop of Mitylene.

EMPEROR. The present time is for disputing, and we will do that afterward.

CARDINAL. The Gospel says: "This do, and that do not omit." Let him go in the meantime.

EMPEROR. We will deliberate.

BISHOP OF COLOCSA. I have seen it.

EMPEROR. I will send it.

ANDREAS. The Ephesian began.

EPHESIAN. In the preceding congregation, reverend father, when we proposed to examine the authority of the great Basil and to settle the difference between the books, we asked your charity whether you thought that it was the opinion of the great Basil that the Spirit is iii in dignity and order. When you assented to this, we asked whether this was also the teaching and opinion of the saints, as Eunomius

said. When you confessed this with the greatest readiness, we produced the great Basil clearly saying the contrary — as it lies in our book. For he says: "he *pretends*" — we say — "to keep the teaching of the saints," but does not actually keep it — "and those therefore who handed on this teaching, he keeps silent about." He then presses on, reproaching him: "Who the saints were and in what discourses they produced the teaching" — he says: "Has this bold man, who insinuates innovations of the teaching of the saints, ever confessed it? If therefore the Son is ii from the Father in dignity and order, because from him" — but the Holy Spirit, Basil in no way accepts calling ii in dignity and order from the Son — is the Spirit not therefore from the Son according to cause? Thus therefore, seeing the contradiction in what you were saying, and then gathering that the addition was corrupt — for he would not have given the reason why the Spirit is ii from the Son, who in no way accepted it as iii — this you passed over, but proposed to show that it was said by the saints that the Spirit is iii in dignity.

On the two authorities of Athanasius: Hence you proposed two authorities of the great Athanasius, one of which says simply that the Spirit is iii in order, and the other says that "the Spirit has such an order toward the Son as the Son has toward the Father." From these you thought you had proved it to be also iii in dignity.

To the first authority, we say this: that the Spirit is iii according to order in the divine Trinity, as the Savior said in the tradition of baptism, we also confess together with you. But that it is iii in dignity, we are astonished at how you take this saying — which has never been said — and you do this also in other cases: when you hear "the Spirit from the Father and the Son," you add "is" and "has being"; and when you hear "it receives from the Son," you say "being." But this is to take the things you are asking about as established — which is the worst type of proof. This has been said for the first.

To the ii, we say that the intention of this great father must be examined in what he says here, and to whom he is speaking. For it is necessary that one who approaches divine discourses — as the divine Cyril says in the authority of the third council — both divide the persons and consider the time and the reason for which each thing was said; for in this way, with the grace of the Holy Spirit, one will be able to understand the opinion of each. The most revered Athanasius, attacking those who were attacking the Holy Spirit, says he had written elsewhere against those who

ordered the Father and the Son together and professed them to be of the same substance and glory, but who, distinguishing the Holy Spirit, said it was not counted together with them but ranked below, as belonging to some alien essence and created nature. Against these he, that noble one, inveighed; and wishing to show the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit and the equality of nature to the Father and the Son — from this in which it was ordered with them, and of the same will and act (for from these things the doctors always showed the identity of nature) — he says such things in the first letter to Bishop Serapion:

"The Son indeed is sent by the Father — for he says thus: 'God so loved the world that he sent his only-begotten Son' [John 3:16]. But the Son sends the Spirit — for he says: 'if I go, I will send the Paraclete' [John 16:7]. The Son indeed glorifies the Father, saying: 'Father, I have glorified you' [John 17:4]. But the Spirit glorifies the Son: 'for he,' says the Son, 'will glorify me' [John 16:14]. The Son says: 'the things I heard from the Father, I speak in the world'; and the Spirit receives from the Son and will announce to you [John 16:14]. The Son comes in the name of the Father; the Spirit — says the Son — 'whom the Father will send in my name' [John 14:26]. Having such a nature and order toward the Son as the Son has toward the Father — how then would one who calls this one a creature not say the same thing of necessity about the Son?"

In these things the discerning doctor does not seem to have wished to show from whence each of the persons has the cause of their being — but rather to show the unity and consubstantiality through the identity of will and the proportion of operations shown. Finally, he does not say that the Son has being from the Father, or the Spirit from the Son, nor that the Father produces the Son and the Son produces the Spirit; for he would have said this himself if he had wished to, according to your opinion. But now, setting these things aside, he posits the good will of the Father — upon which the Son acts — and of the Son again — upon which the Spirit acts. "The Son," he says, "is sent by the Father, but the Son sends the Spirit. In the mission there is good will" — says the great Gregory. Therefore he considers the mission of the Spirit as the good will of the Son. "The Son glorifies the Father, the Spirit glorifies the Son." In these things the analogy of works and the identity of will is seen — because before, the Son appeared to the world, the Father already being known; but afterward the Spirit was known, lest

they appear to be gods set before one another or contrary to one another. Namely: the Son both glorifies the Father and accomplishes the work of that Father; the Spirit glorifies the Son and reveals to the disciples what he had left unsaid. "The Son says," he says, "the things I heard from the Father, I speak in the world; the Spirit receives from the Son and will announce to you." Note, father, what words he receives from the Son and announces to the disciples; now the Son, the things he heard from the Father, speaks those in the world. Therefore it does not receive *being* — as you were saying. "The Son comes in the name of the Father; the Spirit, says the Son, whom the Father will send in my name." Through all these things the identity of will and analogy of works is shown. And from this very thing the identity of essence is gathered by necessity; for "the Spirit has such an order toward the Son as the Son also has toward the Father." That is: the Spirit is thus coordinate with the Son and of the same nature as the Son is with the Father; and how do these say the Spirit is a creature — would they not say the same of the Son? For the Spirit so orders itself to the Son as the Son to the Father, and is of the same nature — as is shown from the identity of will and the analogy of works. How would the Spirit be a creature? Nor is this the opinion of the saint; and for this intention he said what he said, wishing to show the distinction — or rather the unity of essence. And thus the authority does not benefit you nor does it aid your opinion.

On the opinion of Athanasius regarding the procession: But that the great father Athanasius did not hold the same opinion as you concerning the procession of the Spirit, nor thought the Son to be the cause of the Spirit, nor for this reason spoke of this order — this is clearly gathered from what he says elsewhere, handing on the distinction of the divine persons: "the Father alone as the sole source of divinity, as the sole ungenerated." But this is the same as if he had said the sole begetter and sole spirator. Therefore he would not have thought the Son to be the cause of the Spirit, who said the Father alone is the source of divinity. The authority reads as follows, the title of which discourse is *On the Co-eternal Subsistence of the Son and Spirit*: "We are separated from those who Judaize and from those who corrupt Christianity — who deny God from God, who say there is one God like the Jews — not because he is the sole ungenerated and the sole source of divinity, and therefore they call him sole God, but as if he were unfruitful of the Son and unproductive of the living Word." If therefore the Father alone is the source of

divinity as the ungenerated one — that is, the sole begetter of the Son and the sole spirator of the Spirit — then the opinion of the great Athanasius was not that the Son is the cause of the Spirit and that the Spirit has being from the Son.

PROVINCIAL. This manner of investigating truth — which all desire to understand — with such lengthy speeches and citations impedes the truth more than it declares it; nor was this the intention from the beginning of our disputation, but that we should proceed from argument to argument with a response given. All these reverend fathers, already wearied by an hour's listening, solely to respond to the authorities of the last citation — I believe little was understood from the response to those two. This aside, what you charged me with — that I introduced an authority with the word "is" when the word "is" is absent — and also because, according to the authority of the great Athanasius in which he says that "the Spirit has such an order and nature toward the Son as the Son has toward the Father" — it does not signify what I was inferring; and yet you never replicated this authority in its proper form. One never responds well who does not replicate well. But you introduced many authorities, and did not introduce the ones previously mentioned.

Secondly, you entered upon the matter of the production of the divine persons and their emission — concerning which temporal emission it will necessarily be concluded in due time that if the Spirit is sent temporally by the Son, it proceeds from him eternally. And so this was not the matter to be introduced, because it was not relevant to the purpose; nonetheless in due time we will respond. But I want to know one thing: whether you said in this way — that the Son hears from the Father, and so by hearing receives words from the Father, since hearing is with respect to the Word, and this is known in the Gospel — so you said: that the Spirit hears from the Son, and so through that hearing receives words from the Son. Now you do well concede this; but you say that it does not follow that it receives *being*. Is it true that you said this?

EPHESIAN. I said so, because scripture also says this.

PROVINCIAL. From this hearing I will conclude, from many authorities of your doctors and ours, that it receives eternal being. Now I respond to the two things said.

First: you said that in the preceding congregation, when you asked whether Basil's opinion was that the Spirit is *iii* in dignity and order, I responded that this was Basil's opinion — and I say this again, and it is Basil's most true opinion that the Spirit is *iii* in dignity and order, because our book expresses and states this clearly and manifestly.

Secondly: you asked whether this was also the opinion of the saints, and I said yes; and you wished to introduce the contrary, as you also now replicated, saying that Eunomius, according to Basil's words, "scorning the opinion of the many who glorified the Spirit, *pretended* to keep the teaching of the saints," and kept silent about those who said this. Afterward you resumed the last words, where Basil says that saints such as those who said it is *iii* in dignity and order — he could not name them — and concludes: therefore "not so bold a man is he who would introduce novelties into divine dogmas." From this you wished to infer against what I said, because Basil says that he could not name them — from which it followed, according to you, that the holy doctors were not of this opinion — the contrary of which I said.

On the two manuscripts of Basil: I wished to say, because of Basil's words, so that the solution may be better understood — and because we have a Basil which we believe to be most true, and because this other one, which will be produced and which is most ancient, says the same as ours, as we are told by those who have read that book.

ANDREAS. In the meantime the book was brought — the one belonging to the Archbishop of Mitylene — which was found to conform to the letter of ours; and it was a most ancient book. Upon seeing it, the Ephesian said:

EPHESIAN. This book of ours is written in the same hand as your book.

ANDREAS. Upon examining the books, a very great difference was observed.

EMPEROR. We said yesterday that in Constantinople they are so.

CARDINAL. Do you have here another Basil in Florence besides these two?

EPHESIAN. No.

CARDINAL. Here in this city there are three books, and two are for us.

EMPEROR. It is no wonder, because we should not look at those that are here.

PROVINCIAL. We would say the same — that they are elsewhere. Why did you bring the one contrary to yourselves? For now let us stand with these three. Moreover, we have the translation of this authority from the time of Alexander iii — which is more than CCC years ago.

EMPEROR. This is like an analogy: if someone had a case and one side had a hundred witnesses and the other three contrary ones — and the case were decided there where those three were.

CARDINAL. You, summoned to the case, ought to have come with your rights; and you brought the contrary. So let us stand by these.

EMPEROR. My right will appear.

EPHESIAN. I introduced both what precedes and what follows.

PROVINCIAL. From these I will found my argument. On the first point, I wish to do three things. First, I wish to show through another testimony of Basil that in this book against Eunomius he himself says the Spirit receives from the Son. ii, I wish to show that if Basil were to say what stands in your book, it would be placing a great blot on Basil, and that for the honor and reverence of so great a doctor in the Church of God — who received so great a testimony at the Council of Chalcedon — no Christian can in good conscience accept that manner of speaking. iii, I will show from what precedes and follows that what is in our book is true — and I will not go beyond these three things.

I do not doubt that the Spirit works wondrously in this business, since it concerns him; and that he has granted grace to you and to us for your sake, because the same Spirit by which Basil was filled did not, in so great a matter, cause him to write one thing in one place and another in another — for holy doctors are not contradictory in matters of faith.

On the homily of Basil on the Holy Spirit: When I was previously at the house of the lord of Santa Sabina, and with us was brother Ambrose — who has a good gift

of interpretation, reading the Latin language from Greek writings as easily as if they were in Latin — a certain very ancient Greek book was cited, on parchment, containing many works of Basil, produced by a certain skilled interpreter of Greek letters named Leonardo Aretino, Chancellor of this city. While brother Ambrose had the book and we were looking for the letter of Basil, a homily of Basil on the Holy Spirit occurred; I had it read, because if Basil anywhere said something about the Holy Spirit, he says it there. I heard it all, and when we came to this passage, I gave thanks to the Holy Spirit. He says in these words: "One Father, one Son, one Holy Spirit, as one must confess according to the divine tradition" — where it is to be understood: whether we say or whether we believe — it continues: "and not two Fathers nor two Sons; because the Son is not the Spirit, nor is he named so — for we have not received certain things from the Spirit as the Spirit does from the Son, but we have received him himself coming to us and sanctifying us, the communion of divinity, the fellowship of sonship, and the pledge — that is, the sign — and first-fruits of future goods." This authority is so clear that none clearer could be, because the blessed Basil here says that we do not receive certain things from the Spirit as the Spirit does from the Son; and afterward he declares what are those things that we receive from the Spirit: first, sanctification; the communion of divinity; the fellowship of sonship — because we are also called sons of God; and we receive the pledge of eternal inheritance and the first-fruits of future goods. These are what we received from the Spirit, and these are that being which is created and created in us by the Spirit. Now Basil says that the Spirit does not receive from the Son in this manner; it necessarily follows that it receives divine being, because every being is either divine or created. This being indeed we receive from the Holy Spirit, and he himself does not receive it in this way, nor does he receive these created things; therefore it follows that he receives something divine. And thus, this comparison made by Basil itself excludes and refutes the opinion of all the malicious ones who would presume to say that "to receive being" means what is caused in creatures. Let the authority be read.

ANDREAS. The authority was read in Greek.

PROVINCIAL. Now I come to the ii, in which I said that if it were posited as it stands in your book, we would blame and mark Basil. And I set forth the text — both yours and ours — in the common books, so that all of yours may understand

more carefully and ours may see clearly. Ours says thus: "For what necessity is there, if the Spirit is iii in dignity and order, that it also be iii in nature?" Now your text says thus: "For what necessity is there, if the Spirit is ii in dignity and order, that it also be ii in nature?" — as if to say: there is no necessity. Now see the difference: because ours says the Spirit is iii, and yours says the Spirit is ii.

EPHESIAN. It is not so; rather it says: "What necessity is there, if the Spirit is iii, that it be iii in nature?"

PROVINCIAL. I am glad that we agree on this. It follows in ours: "ii in dignity from the Son, having being from him and receiving from him, and announcing to us, and altogether depending from this cause — the discourse of piety has handed this down. But that it be iii in nature, neither have we been taught by the holy scriptures, nor from what was said can we gather it according to consequence." Your book says thus: "ii in dignity, indeed, in being from the Son — *perhaps* the discourse of truth has handed this down" — from which the hesitation of Basil is apparent. Afterward it sets aside what was said and subjoins: "But that it be iii in nature, we have not been taught by holy doctrines, nor can we gather it from what was said." Now let us see, because he immediately subjoins the proof, saying: "As the Son is ii from the Father, because from him and in dignity, because the Father is the beginning and cause of his being, and through him there is access and approach to the Father — that is, to God — he is not ii in nature, because the divinity in both is one." And in this we are in agreement; and in this is the reduction to the cause, because Basil wishes to indicate this: thus it is clear that "the Spirit, although it succeeds the Son in dignity and order, it does not thereby rightly follow that it is of an alien nature." Your book indeed says thus: as for what was said about the Son, we are in agreement. But in that "thus it is clear," we are at variance — because your book says: "thus it is clear that, even if it is subordinated to the Son — which we now also concede — it does not nonetheless follow that it is of an alien nature." So that our book says that it is subordinated and removes the difficulty; for ours says: "although it succeeds the Son in dignity and order." Your book says: "although it is subordinated to the Son."

EPHESIAN. It says "succeeds," and both say the same — that it succeeds the Son in dignity and order.

PROVINCIAL. Read there: "thus it is clear — for just as the Son is ii in order from the Father, because from him, and in dignity, because the Father is the principle and cause of him, and because through him there is access to God the Father — he is not ii in nature, because the divinity in both is one. So the Holy Spirit, although it succeeds the Son in order and dignity, as we entirely concede, is not thereby rightly said to be of an alien nature."

On the word "perhaps" (*fortassis*) and the reputation of Basil: I come to the first — when it says "perhaps" (*fortassis*): this word "perhaps" would introduce a great blot on Basil, because that which is proved by someone ought to be known to the one proving it, since no one can clarify something through what is unknown — but what is less known must be clarified through what is more known. The wise say this, and reason dictates it. Now in this he intends to refute that inference which Eunomius was drawing — that if it were iii in dignity and order, as he had from the doctors, he believed it would be iii in nature. Throughout the entire course of this chapter, he wishes to deduce from the scriptures that some are first, second, and third in order and dignity, and yet it does not follow that they are third in nature; and he takes this as his great foundation. If he had said "perhaps," you would see...

On the conclusion from the authority of Basil: ...gathered from that inference, because he himself sets forth many authorities from scripture in which the order and dignity appear, but not that the Spirit is of a different nature. And therefore Basil concludes, after the authority and the examples of the angels, in the example of the stars, in the example of the mansions that are in eternal life, he concludes thus: "So indeed the Holy Spirit succeeds the Son in dignity and order. We received him to be numbered third from the Father and the Son, the Lord himself teaching the order in the handing on of saving baptism, when it is said: 'Go, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit'; but that it is of a third nature, we have never learned" — and he proves it with the greatest argument: when two things are said — divinity and creature, lordship and servitude, sanctification and the one who is sanctified — and below he says thus: "In which part shall we place the Spirit among those who are sanctified? God forbid; for he himself is sanctification; it is therefore impious to abuse him who is inscribed by number in the divine and most blessed Trinity." From which it is apparent that he does not receive being such that he would be counted among the creatures —

because he says that every thing is either divinity or creature. Since he is not in the number of creatures but in the divinity, and in it he says he is *iii* in dignity and order. And dignity, as was conceded, is said to be the beginning and causing the relation of principle in the origin of the divine persons from within.

And this Basil shows, saying: "not in a third nature truly of him" — because properly speaking, his own people are called such from those who have the relation of principle or cause over them. If he is *iii*, truly also from the Son — therefore it follows necessarily from the antecedents and consequents of this chapter that the Son is the beginning and cause; and this cannot be except through the communication of the divine nature, because this is the order of nature, as I said elsewhere, by which one is from another in divine things and receives from him the nature and so the substance. If he receives this, therefore being — because it is called substance. Now to receive being is the same as to proceed, as is proved, conceded, and most true; therefore if he receives being, of necessity he proceeds.

On other testimonies of Basil: There are other testimonies of Basil from which it will be shown that the Spirit receives being from the Son and proceeds from him — in which you will see more clearly than light that the same Holy Spirit, who caused him to speak in the other testimonies, in no way caused him to speak this truth together with that falsehood adjoined. Let these things suffice regarding the business of Basil.

On the first authority of Athanasius: When you came to the first authority of Athanasius and said that Athanasius only intended to hand on the order placed in baptism, you did not replicate the authority — had you replicated it, you would have responded better. Athanasius says thus, as all understand the response and the empty refutation you made; in that dialogue against Arius he said, as I cited: "If therefore the Spirit is not from the substance of the Father and the Son, for what reason did God the Son number him in the symbol of sanctification, saying: 'Go, teach all, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit?'" He therefore wishes to say, as all clearly understand, that the Holy Spirit, if it is not from the substance of the Father and the Son, is in no way counted in this symbol of sanctification.

On the meaning of "symbol": You Greeks know, moreover, that "symbol" in Latin is said to mean "conference" or "judgment"? And this the blessed Clement, disciple of Peter, says — writing to the blessed James after the death of Peter about how the apostles, coming together as one, made the creed — he sets forth this interpretation, saying it is called "conference" because conferring together they gathered the sentences of faith; "judgment," because it is judged what they rightly believed, and because by this a Christian is distinguished from a non-Christian. Therefore Athanasius calls it the "symbol of sanctification," saying: "If the Spirit were not from the substance of the Father and the Son, he would not be placed in this symbol..."

Now it has been said and declared many times that to be from the substance of the Son is to be from the Son and to have being from the Son, just as to be from the substance of the Father is to be from the Father and to receive being from the Father, because they are the same. Now he says: if the Spirit did not receive being from the Son, it would not be counted with them; it cannot receive from the Son unless he is its principle and cause.

On the Ephesian's charge about gathering testimonies: You say in response to me that I am accustomed to gathering testimonies from here and there that are not to the purpose — as I did yesterday, because I adduced some testimonies of Epiphanius in which I added "is" where it was not written. And I wish to throw back this refutation; and since in this distinguished audience there are most skilled interpreters of Greek letters, and many among you most skilled in philosophy — and especially the lord Emperor — I call all as witnesses, if it is not understood.

In the authorities cited by me, I did not add it myself, but brother Ambrose in translating said that it is necessarily understood. The authority says thus: "he calls the Son him who is from himself, and the Holy Spirit him who is from both, or from both alone." Now I ask whether "is" is understood there. To me it is necessarily understood; and as I have seen from many translations, this seems to be the common manner of the Greek doctors — who in propositions in which the verb is necessarily understood, do not write it — as when it is said "ii in dignity from the Father, because from him," "is" is necessarily understood.

The second testimony was: "neither the Son nor the Father does anyone know except the Spirit, who truly glorifies, who teaches all things, who from the Father and the Son" — "is" is not written, but necessarily understood. On this point I beseech you that henceforth you do not use moralizing language, because such words do not make a testimony more valid; and henceforth, when such authorities are set forth in which the verb is necessarily understood, do not mark me for it.

On the ii authority of Athanasius: As to the ii authority of Athanasius I say briefly that from this authority of Athanasius it follows of necessity that the Spirit is ii from the Son in dignity and order. If you note well the words of Athanasius and weigh them: he says expressly that "the Spirit has such an order and nature toward the Son as the Son has toward the Father." Now he says: "that if someone says the Spirit is a creature, he will of necessity have to say the same of the Son, on account of the conformity of order." Now, as I cited elsewhere, the order of nature is that by which the sprouting sprouts and implies the being of one person from another — and this is the common manner of the philosophers and theologians for taking the order of nature, as I declared elsewhere. Nor is it in your power to force the terms. But we must use them as the doctors use them. Now if the order of nature is the order of origin, by which one person takes from another — which nature is the principle by which, as also your doctor John Damascene holds, that generation is the order of nature, not as of the one generating, but as of that by which the generating one generates, and that principle is that by which it is communicated — now from this authority.

EPHESIAN. Athanasius does not say "order of nature" but "order from nature."

PROVINCIAL. I say that whenever you wish, I will show that it cannot have that understanding. I say that if there is an order according to nature, which is the order of nature — now such an order presupposes in the principle, that is in the person from which another is, the filiation of the principle; and so if it has the relation of principle, it communicates this nature to itself, because these productions are natural; and so it follows in order and dignity that the Spirit is ii from the Son, and receives being, and thus proceeds. To the authority and the emission of the Spirit I will respond in due time.

EMPEROR. You know that we agreed that those disputing would respond to questions with brief words. Here so many words have been said that we do not know where to begin, and the day would not suffice. It would seem fitting that in another session we follow more briefly.

PROVINCIAL. I am lengthy because the proposition is lengthy.

ANDREAS. With this, an end was given to the contention of that day.

Die XIV Martii — On the fourteenth of March, the disputation was begun in the assembly of the city of Florence, in the usual order and manner and at the usual hour of assembly, and the Ephesian's Greek words gave the beginning to the disputation.

EPHESIAN. If we wished to set forth responses to everything said by you for the continuation of the speech, our speech would proceed such that all the time of the disputation would not suffice us. But since the use of lengthy speeches has many times not brought a good end to light, gathering in summary form from what has been said what memory can retain, we will briefly adduce as many responses as we can — by questioning, receiving responses, and responding, if it please you.

On the authority of Athanasius: The first authority of Athanasius cited by you, reverend fathers — you said we did not understand it, because I did not expound it a second time.

PROVINCIAL. So that order be preserved, we first stated the authority of Basil; the authority of Athanasius was introduced afterward; so let us first introduce the authority of Basil.

EPHESIAN. In our preceding congregation the authority of Athanasius was examined, and therefore let us examine the same, so that we may have and receive the declaration on what you said; afterward we will come to the authority of Basil.

PROVINCIAL. If there is no order, confusion follows. The first thing you said in the other congregation was: you asked whether the holy Basil says that the holy doctors hold that the Holy Spirit is iii in dignity and order. Consequently you passed to the following authorities of Athanasius, which I had brought forward.

And when I wished to respond to each in order, I began with the authority of Basil, following your order. And therefore I first adduced the authority from the homily. Secondly I said that if your other exposition were to stand — that Basil was in doubt about the very thing of which he ought to be certain — that was something unworthy. Thirdly I showed that from the antecedents and consequents your addition could not stand. Fourthly I came to the authority of Athanasius, led by your order. It is good that this order be preserved; otherwise we would confuse ourselves — especially because the Emperor requested that there be a reply from argument to argument, and the Pope and we accepted. Therefore follow that order.

EPHESIAN. I wished, according to the order produced by me in the preceding congregation, to speak today in the same manner — first commending the authority of Athanasius which you first produced.

PROVINCIAL. That was second; I will not respond unless you keep the order.

EPHESIAN. And I wished to show that that authority works rather for my sense than for yours.

PROVINCIAL. You will do that afterward.

EPHESIAN. Since you judge that we should follow the order established by you, we will fulfill your wish and examine your words concerning the authority of Basil. We say therefore that you proposed three things: the commendation of your sound and uncorrupted book — which book has been shown by several reasons to be corrupted; you added that this Basil in another homily on the Holy Spirit seems to hold the opinion that the Holy Spirit receives being from the Son. Secondly, you said that the hesitation which arises from our book, on account of the word "perhaps," seems unworthy of the understanding of the great Basil and would bring a blot on the doctor. Thirdly, you endeavored to show from the antecedents and consequents that the authority itself, according to your sense and letter, is the opinion of Basil. To these things, with the authority read in the book, we will say what seems right to us.

ANDREAS. A certain Greek rose and read the homily in these words: "Therefore one Father, one Son, one Holy Spirit is to be confessed according to tradition, and neither two fathers nor two sons; for this reason the Spirit is not named Son — for

we have not received certain things from the Spirit as the Spirit receives from the Son — but we have received him himself coming to us and sanctifying us, the communion of divinity, the participation of sonship, the pledge of eternal inheritance, and the first-fruits of future goods."

EPHESIAN. In this passage, nowhere does it lie that the Spirit is from the Son; neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit are necessarily to be taken from what he receives. And he subjoins that we do not receive certain things from the Spirit as the Spirit receives from the Son — the meaning is equally consonant. And we will show that this belongs to what has been said and to the earlier opinion; for those who attacked the Holy Spirit used such a division: since the Spirit is born from the Father, behold two sons — namely the Son and the Spirit. Against these Basil instructs that one Father and one Son and the Holy Spirit are to be confessed according to divine tradition; for the Spirit, although it proceeds from the Father, is nonetheless not as the Son, nor born from him, and for this reason we do not say two sons. For the Spirit, he says, is neither Son nor named so; and it is clear that we receive the Holy Spirit from the Son — that is, the spirit of adoption — for it is proper to the Son, who is such by nature, that we receive adoption through the Holy Spirit. For this reason the blessed apostle wished to show, in the letter to the Galatians, saying: "God sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying: Abba, Father." If therefore we, receiving the spirit of adoption from the Son, are adopted to the Father through that Spirit — we receive nothing other besides the Spirit, who is other than the Son himself; therefore the Spirit is not his in the way that scripture attests. For this intention the scripture of Basil says that the Spirit is neither Son nor named so, because we do not receive certain things from the Holy Spirit — other, that is, than the Spirit himself and things that subsist by themselves — as we receive from the Son the Spirit, who is another according to his own person; but he sends the Spirit himself coming to us, and we receive sanctification and works in us in his goodness. As the apostle says, one and the same Spirit cooperates with all things, who is infused into each one as he wills. But from where did you receive that the Spirit receives from the Son? This is in no way so, but only from the Father.

PROVINCIAL. And you made a long speech expounding the authority, but you did not touch the main point until now at the end; and I respond from the same

authority, where it is said: "one Spirit is to be confessed, one Father, one Son; that there are neither two fathers nor two sons, and that the Holy Spirit is not the Son." Nor was Basil disputing in that wonderful homily as if he were in doubt about divine dogmas and not asserting them steadfastly.

...and says plainly: "for we have not received certain things from the Spirit as the Spirit from the Son."

EPHESIAN. We say "Spirit" (*pneuma*), because "Spirit" (*pneuma*) in Greek is of neuter gender, and just as *pneuma* can be in the accusative, so it can be in the nominative.

PROVINCIAL. Since it says "even as" (*quemadmodum*), the word *pneuma* cannot be in the accusative case, because it compares our receiving with the receiving that the Spirit makes from the Son — just as if we were to say: "for I do not receive certain things from the Emperor as a lesser prelate receives from the supreme pontiff." It is impossible that the lesser prelate would be in the accusative case; therefore it necessarily follows that "Spirit" (*pneuma*) is in the nominative case.

EPHESIAN. This would be so if it were added there that the Spirit would receive from the Son.

PROVINCIAL. This is necessarily understood.

EPHESIAN. Since this is not in the text, the comparison does not seem fitting, and it is inconsequential to wish to compare the receiving that we make from the Son with the receiving of the Spirit from the Son.

PROVINCIAL. And therefore it is denied, and it is said that there is a difference.

EPHESIAN. I will show this to be outside the meaning of Basil; for Basil intends to show there that the Son is not the Spirit, saying that for this reason the Spirit is not named Son — because we receive him from the Son; from the Spirit himself we do not receive certain things other than the Holy Spirit himself.

PROVINCIAL. This is heretical.

EPHESIAN. We do not receive other things than the Spirit, but the Spirit himself coming to us and working in us his goods — namely adoption. This is the consequent according to the intention of the doctors and according to the sequence of what precedes.

PROVINCIAL. You say that we do not receive certain things other than the Holy Spirit. I ask whether the gifts of the Holy Spirit are the Holy Spirit himself. Respond to the question, since very many things have been said here against all of sacred scripture, and they are false.

EPHESIAN. They are not other in this way — as the Spirit is other than the Son — namely, that they are not other goods that subsist by themselves.

PROVINCIAL. I do not ask this, but I say: are the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which are given to us, the same as the Holy Spirit? Respond formally to this and nothing more.

EPHESIAN. I say the gifts are other than the Holy Spirit — not, however, that they subsist by themselves.

PROVINCIAL. They are other than the Spirit; and first you were saying the contrary — saying that nothing is received from the Spirit except the Spirit himself.

EPHESIAN. Yes, in such a way that we receive from the Son — from the Spirit, although we receive gifts, they do not subsist by themselves, but they are other than the Spirit.

PROVINCIAL. I ask whether the gifts from the Holy Spirit are given together with the Holy Spirit. Now I draw the conclusion.

ANDREAS. With these words having been set forth, the Emperor said the following.

EMPEROR. Because these things are outside the purpose, I do not wish our people to respond to them.

PROVINCIAL. On the contrary, they are to the purpose, and I will show it at once.

EMPEROR. We say it is outside the proposed authority.

PROVINCIAL. We should not give the same meaning to the authority.

CARDINAL. From what has been said, the Provincial wishes to show that *pneuma* is in the nominative case, and thus these things are necessarily relevant to the purpose.

PROVINCIAL. These gifts which we receive from the Spirit are not the Spirit, and they are created in us.

ANDREAS. The Emperor imposed silence on the interpreter — in my judgment, fearing the conclusion — and called his own appointed disputants, spoke with them for a little while, and then, returning to speak, said the following.

EMPEROR. Our difficulty does not rest in this authority alone; we have several others as well.

PROVINCIAL. We will not allow this authority to go undiscussed.

EMPEROR. It is necessary that one matter be discussed, not several.

CARDINAL. We do not wish to enter another matter; but nonetheless for the proof of one, another authority is adduced. And the Ephesian says it is to be understood in one way, the Provincial in another — it is necessary that the true sense be made clear. Let the Ephesian concede the authority to the sense of the Provincial, and we will drop the case.

EMPEROR. We well understand where the words of the Provincial are tending.

PROVINCIAL. If these gifts are not the person of the Spirit —

EPHESIAN. This authority is subject to examination, since the citation is understood differently among you and differently among us; and according to us, the proposition in no way necessarily follows from it. Setting aside this authority for now, we will come to another.

PROVINCIAL. The blessed Cyril in the letter "To our Savior" gives us the teaching that we must attend not only to the authorities but to the intentions that are in them. If we must produce a testimony and not investigate the sense of the testimonies, we would be acting against the rule of the blessed Cyril. Now, in following that rule, I say thus: this authority has no doubt for us, and from it has clarity; but in wishing to give a twisted meaning it could have doubt. You gave a wholly distorted sense, totally against the letter, saying: "we do not receive certain things from the Spirit, as we receive the Spirit from the Son." This exposition implies a contradiction, because we receive certain things from the Spirit in the same way as we receive certain things from the Son — because in receiving the Spirit from the Son we receive the gifts of the Holy Spirit together with what was said above; and in receiving the Spirit we receive the Spirit together with the gifts. And this is what the apostle says: "the charity of God is diffused in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us." If therefore we receive the Spirit from the Son, we receive the gifts together with the Spirit — or gifts from the Spirit. We receive the Spirit together with gifts. Now Basil says: "we do not receive certain things from the Spirit as the Spirit from the Son," and he establishes a difference. Therefore, according to your exposition, a contradiction is implied; therefore it is necessary that *pneuma* be in the nominative case.

So the exposition first stated stands clear, where he says: "for we do not receive certain things from the Spirit, just as the Spirit from the Son" — because these gifts, distinct from the Spirit as conceded by you, and what the Spirit receives from the Son is something divine, and what the Spirit is, is something uncreated. But the gifts in us are created; and this is the true meaning of that authority — to which you should respond, since we are not departing from the text.

EPHESIAN. We say: we could save your exposition and also the first words you spoke about the gifts, because we say thus — that without the Spirit himself we do not receive them, since the whole Spirit is received in each of his gifts. And we say that with these things established, our exposition can be saved, since we do not receive certain things from the Spirit that subsist by themselves, as the Spirit from the Son. And to this exposition it is consonant that the Spirit is not the Son — this also follows from the said authority — that we do not receive certain things from the Spirit as the Spirit receives from the Son, but we receive the Spirit himself. We

say that this exposition can be saved, and the first words are not: "But that the Spirit receives being from the Son" — as you added — "while we from the Spirit receive creatures" — these things neither come from consequence nor are they gathered at all by necessity. And around this part is the controversy between us. Show, from what is gathered from the authority, that the Spirit receives being from the Son, and we from the Spirit.

EMPEROR. To your question he wished to respond, but he will respond no more.

PROVINCIAL. This is not a response.

EMPEROR. We did not come to hear many things, but to discuss one.

PROVINCIAL. I do not depart from the authority, but I say that *pneuma* cannot be in the accusative case — because when we say that we receive the Spirit from the Son, it is nothing other than to receive the Spirit together with gifts; and this is clear through the apostle, who says: "the charity of God is diffused in our hearts through the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us" — namely from the Son. Therefore to receive the Spirit from the Son is nothing other than to receive the Spirit together with gifts. When we received the gifts from the Spirit — which are enumerated in this very authority, namely the communion of divinity, the participation of sonship, and the pledge of eternal divinity — these are the gifts. These we receive from the Spirit, as Basil says. Therefore those things we receive from the Spirit are those things we receive from the Son through the Spirit, or which we have through the Spirit from the Son. Now the authority says the contrary: "for we do not receive certain things from the Son as the Spirit from the Son." If it were in the accusative, they would be the same; therefore there must be a distinction between that which the Spirit receives from the Son and what we receive from the Son or from the Spirit. Now since this is one most well-known principle, and the blessed Basil sets it down in the authority saying: "when two things are said — divinity and creature" — saying every thing is either created or creator — these gifts received from the Spirit are created gifts, distinct from the Spirit who is the creator. Therefore if we do not receive certain things from the Spirit as the Spirit from the Son, it must necessarily be that what the Spirit receives from the Son is something divine; and this is the clearest meaning of Basil, and thus his exposition can in no way stand.

EMPEROR. Concerning the exposition of this authority it is not necessary that our people think what you expound, or you what they think.

PROVINCIAL. I consider you, Emperor, a learned and wise man, and I believe you understand this authority very well; and if you inquire with all your philosophers and doctors, you will see manifestly that it is not possible for this authority to have another meaning. If it please you to acquiesce in this authority, let us proceed to others; because if we pass through testimonies in this way, we will never have the truth on our side. This is the way of truth, because we do not intend to win, nor do you; but we wish that truth have its place and be assented to.

EMPEROR. The purpose of us and ours is not to use contentions, but to see the truth with diligent inquiry. And therefore our people do not now wish to permit responses; but because this authority seems ambiguous, it does not seem that one should press on it.

PROVINCIAL. The listeners hear whether it is ambiguous or not.

EMPEROR. Our people heard whether it is clear.

CARDINAL. The lord Provincial has very well declared the sense of this authority, and all understand it well. Hence, if you do not wish to respond further, we are content that we proceed to others, and let it be held as declared.

EMPEROR. We do not hold it as declared.

CARDINAL. Respond.

EMPEROR. A response will be given in due time.

CARDINAL. Now is the time.

ANDREAS. The Emperor sent one of his own to the Pope to speak privately; he then returned to the Emperor and spoke privately. Then the Emperor asked the Cardinal of Sant'Angelo to come to him; he rose from his place and went to him, then after speaking with him for a little while he returned to the Pope and spoke with him privately. And while the lord of Sant'Angelo was with our lord, the Archbishop of Russia came to the Emperor, and several other Greeks, and they

held a very long discussion among themselves. While these things were going on, the Cardinal said to the Provincial: continue.

PROVINCIAL. Enough has been said about this authority; and therefore, since it pleases the Pope and the Emperor, let us proceed to another authority of Basil.

EPHESIAN. This authority is dubious; let us pass to others.

PROVINCIAL. Since this one is clear and most clear, let us therefore proceed to others.

EPHESIAN. As to what you said in commendation of the great Basil — that the authority stood as in your book, and that this was something unworthy of the mind of the great Basil, that he should put hesitation into his words and say "perhaps" — to this we again say thus.

PROVINCIAL. Do you have the reasoning I made?

EPHESIAN. Which?

PROVINCIAL. Mine.

EPHESIAN. You will see in the response. That it was the opinion of the saints — as Eunomius said — that the Spirit is iii in order and dignity, seems entirely, according to the blessed Basil, not to hold according to the first part of the opposition; for he says: "he pretends to keep the teaching of the saints," and consequently, who the saints were, he could not say. Was there ever so bold a man who introduces innovations of divine dogmas? And surely Eunomius had nothing to say about any of the saints having said this; for if he had any, he did not consider Athanasius a saint, nor anyone before him, which would be the opinion of the saints. This neither Eunomius had to say, nor did the great Basil accept it. But since it is plausible that Eunomius said this is in divine scripture — our Savior saying in the tradition of saving baptism: "Go, baptize them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" — and from this it seems that we gather the Spirit as iii in dignity and order; and while Basil allows this, he says the Spirit is ii in dignity from the Son by saying "perhaps the discourse of piety has handed this down" — meaning the discourse of piety being what is handed on through the holy

Gospels — he says he accepts the discourse in this sense, such that perhaps someone would say the discourse of piety has handed this down, that is, divine scripture.

...and the one thing is stated absolutely, and so also the other. Now your book in this inference says thus: "So the Holy Spirit, if it succeeds in dignity and order" — as they say — then in the rendering of nature, your book says: "For we received him to be numbered *iii* in order and dignity." So there is no other difference between you and us. I believe I have well replicated our book and yours. Now since I have seen no other difference in anything, it appears that from these things the truth is to be gathered; and patience must be borne if we press on the understanding of this chapter, because this is the beginning of the third book against Eunomius, and from these foundations he wishes to dispute against Eunomius throughout the whole book. If these foundations were dubious, your book would prove little in the whole book. Now I ask: from this very text and from the beginning of the book, does he believe that Basil held that the holy fathers who preceded him had held this?

EPHESIAN. I say that the blessed Basil did not hold this opinion nor received it from the saints, nor did Eunomius say that he had received it from the saints; and this is apparent from the words of Basil.

PROVINCIAL. It is good that the sacred audience also understand what precedes these words: "For what necessity." Since he touched on two points and left aside not a few preceding matters, let us see them and the following will be understood. The blessed Basil begins the book thus; then after two lines he sets forth the words of Eunomius, saying thus: "Not satisfied with blasphemies against the Only-begotten, he passes to the Son, speaking of things consequent to his whole will" — saying that Eunomius said nothing except from his own will. Then he sets forth the words of Eunomius, saying: "Since it is sufficient for us to have said much about the Son, it is consequent also to speak about the Paraclete — not following the undiscussed opinions of the many, but preserving the teaching of the saints in all things, from whom, since we learned that it is *iii* in order and dignity, we believed it to be *iii* also in nature." These are the words of Eunomius, no more — in which he touches three things. First, he does not wish to follow the undiscussed opinions of the many. Secondly, he says that he wishes to preserve in

all things the teaching of the saints. Thirdly, that having learned from them that it is *iii* in order and dignity, he learned it to be *iii* in nature.

To this Basil responded thus, saying: "namely it is clear that he does not think one ought to adhere to the simple and rude faith of the many by using artificial sophistical speeches; he inverts the truth as it seems to him, which he showed to have been done in the discourses on the Only-begotten." Now what Eunomius said — that he did not wish to follow the undiscussed opinions of the many — Basil, replying, says: "I do not think one ought to adhere to the simplicity of the opinions of the many." He speaks of those scorning the opinions of the many who glorify the Spirit. He himself knew what the opinion was that glorified the Spirit; scorning that opinion, he pretends to keep the teaching of the saints, and keeps silent about those who handed it on — "doing now also what he was shown to have done in the other discourses on the Only-begotten." Now he responds to the *iii* point, saying that he claims to have learned from the saints that the Spirit exists *iii* in dignity and order, and that from himself he has believed it also to be *iii* in nature. But who the saints are who produced this teaching, he cannot say. "Was there then ever so bold a man who introduced novelty into divine dogmas?" And it follows: "For what necessity."

On whether Basil knew the opinion of the many: I ask: since Basil says "scorning the opinion of the many who glorify the Spirit," whether Basil knew that opinion of the many who glorified the Spirit. It must be said that he did — otherwise he would not have posited it. Secondly, I inquire, as in the preceding day: "one ought not to adhere to the simple and rude faith of the many, but to artificial ones, etc." Who were the artificial and sophistical speeches? And if he himself can understand, who were the sophistical speeches — and he knows this well enough — he will understand who were the saints who held this opinion. Let him speak to these two things.

EPHESIAN. The opinion of the many who glorified the Spirit — I say the opinion of Christians: since the Spirit is ordered to the Father and the Son through the tradition of saving baptism, of necessity the Spirit is of the same glory, and thus of the same nature as the Son.

PROVINCIAL. I ask whether Basil knew this multitude.

EPHESIAN. He knew many who glorified.

PROVINCIAL. Which are the artificial speeches?

EPHESIAN. The artificial and sophistical speeches were those of Eunomius himself, because he scorned the opinion of the many. Secondly, while pretending to keep the teaching of the saints — and there was no one who said it — he assumes the Spirit to be *iii* in dignity and order, and thus artificially and sophistically gathers that since the Spirit is *iii* in dignity and order, it would be *iii* in nature. Wishing to repel this, Basil supposes in what follows that even if we consider it to be *iii* in dignity and order — as he was gathering — it does not follow that it was *iii* in nature. These were the artificial speeches, which he pretended to have from the saints, but did not have.

PROVINCIAL. Eunomius was inferring that he had received from the saints that the Spirit is *iii* in order and dignity, and was saying this absolutely and from himself believing it to be *iii* in nature. For it was necessary for him to have a sophistical and very artificial argumentation to prove this — which he posits as manifest, because it is his conclusion. Because he received it from the saints, he thus argues, making the artificial one — it was necessary that he not conclude according to Basil. Now Basil says correctly that he pretended to keep the teaching of the saints, but does not posit what is artificial and sophistical. Let it suffice for us that this Eunomius inferred it from some absolute and unconditional antecedent; and when you pay attention, you will see the conclusion is so. Now these saints who held the opinion by which the Spirit was glorified were those whom Basil followed; and from that opinion by which they glorified the Spirit, Eunomius could not form his antecedent and infer the consequent which he believed. And these saints were manifest; and since their opinion could not support him, he did not name those saints — not in the two preceding ones nor in this one — because doctors could not be found who said the Spirit is *iii* in order and dignity such that it would follow that it is *iii* in nature; and if any could have been found, they would have been even more against him. Other saints who said it is *iii* in dignity and order were manifest, and Basil does not say that he himself could not find the saints. And from this root you took your origin, saying: "who the saints are and where they produced the teaching, he cannot say" — and from this you believed

that because Basil said Eunomius could not say it, Basil himself would not have certainty about the saints who said it; and this is false.

EPHESIAN. I do not say that Basil was not certain.

PROVINCIAL. I say that it is true that Eunomius could not say it.

EPHESIAN. Eunomius could not say it?

PROVINCIAL. Because saints were not to be found who held the procession in divine things from outside; and the Arians held it, and Eunomius appeared to hold it. Now I speak to the argument. I wished to state the text, so that all may understand it. Now Basil takes certain things to attack Eunomius, arguing thus: "Whoever proceeds... as the Son is related to the Father, so the Spirit to the Son" — and through those examples posited afterward he concludes that proposition absolutely, as he had posited it; because that is true which proceeded by advancing from true things to true and absolute things, because the rule is that never from a true thing does a false or dubious thing follow. Because if the premises are true and absolutely true, true and absolute things always follow — whether the premises be through authorities or through reasons, because authorities are in the place of reasons. Now from your book, from true and absolute premises, a dubious conclusion would follow. Secondly, one would proceed from a dubious antecedent to prove a true and necessary consequent. This is the consequent — that it is not iii in nature — and it is necessary; and the antecedent would be dubious. Let it be seen what confusion and mark would follow for him from these two; and from these two I was arguing that your text cannot stand. Respond to these two reasons.

EPHESIAN. You do not necessarily conclude when you say that from what is absolutely true and simple, an absolute truth necessarily follows. For something can be absolute and true in itself, and what is shown from it need not be simply true but only by supposition. For this reason also the great Basil, in the example of the angels and the stars and the mansions, says it is simply true and shows that those who are ii and iii in nature are not necessarily so because they are ii and iii in dignity and order. For the conclusion, on account of which he takes the examples, he does not show what is simple and absolute, but what he granted by supposition first — that if the Spirit were granted to be iii in dignity and order, as they say and

as they take the authority of the Gospel to heart — for their commendation they had it, but the Spirit is not necessarily *iii* in nature. Therefore it is not necessary — as was being said — that everything which is simply and absolutely true and shown to be so stands in that way.

PROVINCIAL. I posit: if a man runs, therefore a man moves. This proposition does not say that a man runs nor that a man moves, but conditionally — because there is only the necessity of the consequence.

EPHESIAN. This is a supposition on account of the word "if."

PROVINCIAL. Is it not a good consequence? Certainly — and yet nothing is posited either in the antecedent or in the consequent. But if I say: "a man runs, therefore a man moves" — because if I posit in existence: "a man runs," it follows that "a man moves," and this is the necessity from the consequent. So Basil does here: just as this matter stands with regard to the angels and the stars and the mansions, so it stands with the persons. This he presupposes. But so it is in the case of the angels — positing no condition — therefore it must follow necessarily without any condition; otherwise he would appear most unskilled in that process.

EPHESIAN. In those things assumed by supposition, if the assumption is inferred, the assumption affirms the supposition. We say: "if a man runs, he moves" — and we infer the man by supposition, but the man runs: let the supposition be conceded, and what is gathered from it is necessarily gathered. If the assumption were not at all inferred, the supposition would not necessarily be conceded, but can remain in ambiguity. It is dubious whether, if a man runs, the inference of his being moved follows. So in the authority of Basil he says: "the Spirit is *iii* in dignity and order, it is *iii* in nature" — this does not necessarily follow: "it is *iii* in dignity and order, therefore also *iii* in nature."

PROVINCIAL. This is the conclusion.

EPHESIAN. This is shown from the example of the angels. In this he does not include the assumption — for he did not add: "but it is *iii* in dignity and order" — but posits it as doubtful. But even if he had posited it as certain, this would not have followed necessarily, as I said in the case of the angels. These things were conceded by supposition.

PROVINCIAL. You respond to nothing, because it follows of necessity: "if a man runs, therefore a man moves." In regard to the positing of lower things, the higher things follow; for motion was in the running; therefore if a man runs, it is necessary that he moves. And yet it is not held that he runs or moves unless I make the proposition in existence in the minor — namely "if a man runs" — and therefore it follows "and therefore a man moves." And therefore Basil says that so it stands in the case of the angels.

EPHESIAN. You name the example as a supposition.

PROVINCIAL. He himself posits the example absolutely.

EPHESIAN. The blessed Basil takes the examples as proof of the supposition, and does not posit the opinion of the saints, but gives this by concession.

PROVINCIAL. These examples are absolute. Just so — when we argue from creatures to the Creator, are not the creatures taken as an absolute antecedent, and from that do we not infer about God? When Aristotle wished to prove the first cause to be unmoved, he says thus: "Whatever is moved, is moved by something" — he does not posit it by supposition, but absolutely. If he had posited it by condition, he would not have proved the first cause to be unmoved except by condition and through the inference of the consequence; and thus we would have no truth from the first cause. So Basil from the angels — and what is said from creatures in holy scripture is posited absolutely, wishing from these creatures to come to the knowledge of the truth of the divinity — saying: although it is *iii* in dignity, it does not follow that it is *iii* in nature. If he had posited this antecedent conditionally, he would have proved no more than that "if a man runs, therefore he moves" — he would have inferred nothing from the angels nor from God; and thus with Eunomius he would have disputed only about the conditional inference. What would this disputation have been worth? Hence it is necessary that our sense be held. Do your best to see well and to preserve the honor of the blessed Basil.

ANDREAS. And thus was the end for that day.

Die XVII Martii — On the seventeenth of March, the disputation was begun.

EPHESIAN. Our faith did not have its commendation from men or through men, but through our Lord Jesus Christ himself, who personally spoke to the disciples. Therefore, setting aside ambiguous authorities — though the authorities themselves, when legitimately examined, seem rather to have worked for us than against us — I will have recourse to what we ought to treat concerning the faith. For the great Basil would never have treated or suggested anything against the dominical or apostolic tradition, or against those who succeeded them, nor in consequence against them — as has been shown through other authorities and will be shown further, God granting to us speech in the opening of our mouth. Come then, let us honor the disciple from the master and the servant from the lord. And we will show him to be consonant both with himself and with the things he treated among men.

On the words of Christ about the Spirit: First therefore God the Word himself — the i of the theologians and teacher of theology — in his last address, when he appeared to the disciples, said the secrets of theology: "When the Paraclete comes, whom I will send you from the Father — the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father — he will bear testimony of me." In these things, when the three divine persons are seen, the Lord himself with three words accommodates what is proper to each. Of the Spirit alone he says: "when he comes"; of himself with the Father he says: "whom I will send you from the Father"; again of the Father alone: "who proceeds from the Father." See therefore the careful theology. For by that "when he comes" he shows freedom and lordship; by that "whom I will send you from the Father" he shows the good will of himself and the Father in the mission...

...fled, and entered another matter — and we did not even say, with his permission: the ones sanctified, who proceed from him, straightway added "the Father," lest anyone think the procession refers to the Son — because they spoke of him proximately just before. Moreover...

CARDINAL. He transgresses the form given, in which we arranged that we should proceed from authority to authority.

EPHESIAN. This master, responding to a single authority produced by us, took so much time that he took all the time — as he also did in the preceding session. Therefore we, seeing this, thought it necessary to do thus: to adduce all our reasons

at once and together, so that at least, being compelled, he would respond to each one. Moreover, hampered by illness, we cannot respond to things one by one.

PROVINCIAL. In our preceding disputation, by mutual agreement between our lord and the Emperor, it was agreed and concluded that we should proceed from chapter to chapter and from article to article. And therefore we first began from the authority of Basil, placed at the feast of Pentecost; and although many things were said concerning that authority in the investigation of Basil's understanding, we never departed from the proposed authority. With that settled, we came to the authority of Basil. In this I was somewhat lengthy in expounding the very text — not departing from the text — because if I wished to make a reasoned argument from the very text, it was necessary that the sacred assembly have knowledge of the text. I never introduced another authority except the words of the text. And because the arguments were taken from the antecedents and consequents, it was necessary to state those; and having made the declaration of the text, I formed two reasons to prove of necessity that the text could not stand with that word of hesitation — so that, as the nature of the matter required, I could not be briefer.

Now as for the arguments that were last in our departure: if the best order was to be observed, he ought to have responded. One of two things follows: either he saw that my reasons conclude and that he cannot respond — and this pleases us, if he confesses it — or he wished to... if he wished to avoid the arguments that conclude, he ought not to have passed to the authorities of Athanasius, which were produced second, and which necessarily conclude just as the authority of Basil. Now he does not respond to the arguments nor observe the order; from the authorities of Athanasius he passes to the authorities of the Gospel, as if the first authorities were not founded on the text of the Gospel. Is not the authority of Basil founded on the words "he will receive of mine and will announce to you"? Are not the word of piety and of baptism founded on the word of God, when he says "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"? Now what does the word of Christ say? "Who proceeds from the Father." The same says in the middle of chapter **XVI**, declaring how "who proceeds from the Father" ought to be understood, saying: "all that the Father has is mine; therefore I said: he who will receive of mine." Since therefore the authority of divine scripture — of Jesus Christ — was first set in the middle by the holy doctors and brought into the force

of argumentation, it is very absurd and unbecoming in so great an audience that, having dismissed this great authority undiscussed, with no response made to the reasons that were compelling, we pass to others.

Now I say thus: let him speak at length — because I do not have the power to impose a law on him, but the Emperor does. I will preserve the decorum and order of the disputation and will never respond to him on anything he says until he responds in order, as we began the disputation. Now see, if you wish to spend the time in vain. I require him by the duty of decorum and disputation to respond to my reasons, because from these we will clearly have the intention of Basil — unless our most holy lord commands me otherwise. I have said before and say now: that in the iii synod this was confirmed, as Cyril said; and this ought to be the rule for you and for me, as he says: "following the confessions of the holy fathers, which they made with the Holy Spirit speaking in them, and investigating the understandings, we speak." Thus must the testimonies be led, so that we investigate the intentions of the saints.

ANDREAS. The Greeks spoke among themselves.

EPHESIAN. We have in no way abandoned the manner of disputation as we mutually agreed; but your paternity knows that when we proposed two or three authorities, we consumed over them all the preceding disputations. Therefore, so that this should not always happen through the named responses of yours to our speeches, it seemed to us to adduce all our reasons — not from certain hidden books unknown to all, nor from dubious and corrupted ones, but from the sacred scriptures themselves, and from those sentences professed by all the fathers. For if we always spend the time examining the same authority, while you seek to respond to my arguments and reasons, the process would be infinite. Therefore, because we gave a clear and manifest response concerning that addition of hesitation found in our books, it seemed fitting to omit that authority — so that the process may not always go on indefinitely — to adduce our reasons; then the words of Basil, which are consonant with all of these, so that from all of these it may be apparent that your book is corrupted. Afterward you can take up each authority and examine it disputatively as you wish — if God shall grant it and time allows.

EMPEROR. Our intention is not that the order of disputation be changed; and if you had wished to wait until the end of the speeches, he himself would have come to the purpose of the dismissed authority. Because our intention and that of ours is not to divert from the manner of the disputation, and that you should be responded to. I arranged this because you were speaking and ours were responding little, and we could not say what we wished. Therefore it seemed fitting to omit these authorities so that we might come to the conclusion of the proposed authority. Therefore, if it please you, permit the lord Ephesian to speak, because little remains.

PROVINCIAL. This manner is not useful, because if he must return to the purpose and say many things to which no response should be made, these seem superfluous to say; because if he wishes to have a response to them, it is better that they be deduced from authority to authority than that all be adduced at once — because men forget and a good response cannot be made. He himself should first respond to what was proposed by me, and then I would speak.

ANDREAS. The Cardinal went to the Pope and then returned.

CARDINAL. Although it would be more urbane and just to preserve the manner begun — from authority to authority — nonetheless, since the Ephesian wishes to accumulate many authorities, it pleases our lord, together with this, that our questions receive a response.

EMPEROR. Agreed.

EPHESIAN. Let us return to the consequence of what we were saying — that the holy first ecumenical council responded to a doubting philosopher through Bishop Leontius with these words: "Accept one divinity of the Father, who begot the Son ineffably, and who was born from him..."

On the authority of the first ecumenical council: ...from himself, and of the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father himself, who is proper to the Son, as the apostle says: 'If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not his.' This indeed is how the authority stands; but it must be considered that these blessed fathers, fearing that when someone heard "of the Spirit who proceeds from him," they might think they were speaking of the Son — because the mention of the Son

had just been made proximately — they added "from the Father himself." The meaning is thus: "not from the Son, but from the Father" — and straightaway again "proper to the Son." For he says: even if it does not proceed from the Son, nonetheless it is not alien to the Son, but proper to his substance and consubstantial with him. And for this intention the apostle says: "if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he himself is not his." This is what Cyril thinks: "even if the Spirit proceeds from God the Father, yet it is not alien to the Son" — this is what he himself says, when responding to Theodoret, as we will say more carefully if time permits, who was accusing him and saying that the Spirit proceeds also from the Son.

On Basil's consonance with the first council: The great Basil, speaking consonantly with these fathers — I mean the fathers of the first council, who came immediately after them — says thus in chapter **XVIII** to Amphilochius: "the Spirit of Christ is called such as being fitted to his nature" — that is, as consubstantial. But if he had known that it receives being from the Son, as it lies in your corrupted book, he would not have said "as fitted to him according to nature," but "as proceeding from him and receiving being from him." This would have been the consequent; since he did not say it, your book does not stand well.

On Basil's treatise against Sabellius: He himself says in the discourse against Sabellius and Arius the following: "I know the Spirit together with the Father, but not the Father to be the Spirit." (Greek: *ἐγὼ μετὰ πατρός μὲν οἶδα, οὐχὶ δὲ πατέρα τὸ πνεῦμα* — "I know the Spirit with the Father, but not the Father to be the Spirit.")

PROVINCIAL. Do you have the book?

EPHESIAN. Not here.

PROVINCIAL. It must be adduced.

EPHESIAN. "I know the Spirit together with the Father, not the Father; and I received it with the Son, not named the Son, but the familiarity which is with the Father" — I understand this because it proceeds from the Father; and with respect to the Son, because I hear: "if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not his." Do you see also that these things are consonant with himself and with those

fathers? He does not say the same property of familiarity of the Spirit toward the Father and toward the Son, but toward the Father because it proceeds from him; and toward the Son, because the authority of the apostle says that "if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ" — namely, that it is simply familiar to him according to nature in this way, as is said in the previously cited authority, not that it proceeds from him.

What could be whiter or clearer concerning the intention of this man than these words? Was it plausible that he would have written this if he knew the Spirit to proceed from the Son? Judge, you fathers, that we may use the truth. These are the first councils — with which, as we have shown, the great Basil is consonant.

On the ordering of the Holy Spirit in the creeds: The first synod itself in the creed thus ordered the Holy Spirit together with the Father and the Son, according to that tradition of baptism handed on by the Lord, and added after the confession of Father and Son: "and in the Holy Spirit." But the second council, which was made after it, wishing to explain this word and to show more clearly how the Spirit is coordinated with the Father and the Son — for the subversion of those who were fighting against the Spirit — says thus in the creed: "We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father, who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified together."

On the intention of the fathers in composing the creed: This intention of the divine fathers must be examined, because their purpose was to explain the theology and the mode of the union of the Spirit with the Father and the Son. This council clearly wished to set this forth; and see how it differently sets forth the familiarity of the Spirit toward the Father and toward the Son. For it says also that the Holy Spirit is coordinated with the Father and the Son by those fathers as "proceeding from the Father" — and "together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified" — that is, of the same honor and consubstantiality. But truly, if they had known it to proceed from both, why, when that council made mention of both, did it not first say "who proceeds from the Father and the Son," and afterward add "who together with them is co-adored and co-glorified"? This would have been the consequent, if they had held such a meaning; and this is what we habitually do when we refer something to two things, and especially when we say that something has its cause from those very things — we first set forth both causes, and then draw

what is common, and lastly, if need be, add, for example: "who together is co-glorified and adored." But since the fathers omitted in the first part the mention of the Son when they wished to add the cause of the Spirit, and in the second part wished to set forth consubstantiality and identity of honor — they therefore did not know the Spirit as proceeding from the Son. For this they would not have omitted, especially when they were making an exposition, and so that the exposition would be perfect and not defective — as you say — nor would either of the causes be kept silent. This is clear, because after that council they made no other exposition from that one, nor did they add "proceeding from the Son." On the contrary, all the councils prohibited and avoided this through their definitions — having foreknown, surely, what you were going to do.

On Gregory the Theologian: The champion and leader of this council, and the composer of this creed — as is said — was the great Gregory, whose epithet is properly attributed from theology. He himself, writing consonantly with himself and the other fathers in the discourse whose title is "On the Voyage of the Bishops from Egypt," says: "all that is the Father's belongs to the Son, except the cause." This must be examined — that he himself also distinguishes the Son from the Father by cause, as the great Dionysius does by the "source." If therefore the Son is distinguished from the Father by cause, and is in no way a cause, it is clear that he is neither a father nor a producer — and therefore neither the cause of the Spirit. For this the doctor sets forth openly.

On the third council: Consonant with all these things the third council also said. For when the creed of Nestorius, produced through a certain presbyter Charisius, was brought in — in which it was contained that "the Holy Spirit is neither Son nor has subsistence through the Son" — the theology of this kind is praised by it as familiar to the fathers and consonant with scripture. So much so that it did not accuse him on any point, great or small, nor does anything follow concerning Nestorius from the speeches on theology. Indeed, approving such a creed, it says in its own creed: "If any were found either knowing or teaching those things contained in the exposition adduced by Charisius concerning the humanity of the only-begotten Son of God — that is, the wicked dogmas of Nestorius — they shall be subject to the sentence of this sacred and holy ecumenical council." Do you see, fathers, from this: those who call them "the wicked dogmas of Nestorius" say those

things which concern "the humanity of the only-begotten Son of God"? It is clear that those things which concerned the theology were most true and holy, and gave no occasion for complaint — hence they made no complaint about those things. And this is no small matter for approbation: that it is the common sense of the church that the Spirit in no way proceeds from the Son. For it is clear, since the fathers accepted and had this and recognized it as their own opinion.

Thus this was also approved by the iii ecumenical council. But when the blessed Cyril, opposing Nestorius concerning the procession of the Spirit, gave a certain occasion for thinking that it also has subsistence from the Son, Theodoret reproved him as if speaking for the Easterners, saying thus: "The Spirit proper to the Son — if he said it as being of the same nature and proceeding from the Father, as we will confess and thus accept the word — if however as having subsistence from the Son or through the Son, we will shake it off as blasphemy. We believe the Lord who says: 'the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father' [John 15:26]. Also the apostle: 'but you have received not the spirit of the world, but the one who is from God' [1 Cor. 2:12]."

On Cyril's response to Theodoret: To this complaint, Cyril says first that he was being slandered about what he wrote to a certain bishop Eupotius, and was being accused by Theodoret, who was inveighing against him out of enmity and friendship with Nestorius. He says thus, writing to Eupotius: "I received, to the certainty of the disposition inherent in your smallness, that tome which was sent, which they say Theodoret of Cyrrhus composed — for so they say the little town is called. But when I saw what was in it, I gave songs of thanks to God, not failing to say: 'Lord, deliver my soul from lying lips and from a deceitful tongue' [Ps. 119:2], for I find myself slandered everywhere and in every one of the chapters I endure this." If therefore in every one of the chapters he says he is slandered, it is clear that also in that one he is slandered — when Theodoret called that opinion blasphemous and impious. Therefore Theodoret was not slandering him as holding that opinion; on the contrary, that same opinion which Theodoret was professing, Cyril also held with him — and that he would accept the word, namely: "this is the Holy Spirit proper to him, as of the same nature with him, yet nonetheless proceeding from the Father."

This same thing Cyril also added in defense of the complaint; for he says thus: "even if the Spirit proceeds from the Father, nonetheless it is not alien to the Son — for all things it has from the Father." Do you see how in that part he agrees with what Theodoret was saying, and that he accepts that word? After this, the union having been made with the Easterners, the blessed Cyril writes to John the Bishop of Antioch on the same matter — of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and also that the creed should remain unchanged — saying thus: "In no way do we tolerate that the faith defined by the fathers — that is, the creed of faith — should be moved, nor do we permit ourselves or others to change either the wordings of what has been set down or a single syllable, keeping in mind him who says: 'Do not transgress the eternal boundaries which your fathers set' [Prov. 22:28]. Those who were speaking were not they themselves, but the Spirit of the Father, who proceeds from him — and is not alien to the Son in respect of essence."

Do you see also here in which part of Theodoret's division the blessed Cyril is found? For he says, putting forth the speech in the form of a division: "he proceeds indeed from God the Father; he is not alien to the Son" — that is, the Spirit is consubstantial in respect of essence. And this is what Cyril himself was saying — that if he said it as consubstantial and proceeding from the Father, "let us accept the word as pious."

On Theodoret's agreement with Cyril: When Theodoret, together with the other Easterners, received this letter and found the theology consonant with scripture, he himself also says in a letter to John of Antioch: "What was sent by Cyril is adorned with the nobleness of the Gospel..." ...our Lord Jesus is said thus, but the Holy Spirit does not have subsistence from the Son or through the Son, but from the Father; and yet he is called and named proper to the Son as consubstantial. Having conceded this rectitude, we will praise him... healing tongues and transforming discordant sound into true sound. Do you see in what things Theodoret together with the other Easterners agreed with Cyril — that the Holy Spirit does not have subsistence from the Son nor through the Son, but proceeds from the Father, while the Spirit of the Son is named as consubstantial?

On the confirmation of the union: And that they agreed on these things and that union was made, the blessed Cyril is a witness, writing to John the Bishop of Antioch: "Having examined your sacred words, and finding you also thinking with

us — 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism' [Eph. 4:5] — we glorified God the Savior, rejoicing with one another, because the faith of our church and yours, agreeing with the divinely inspired scriptures and the tradition of the holy fathers, are consonant." Consonant with these things also in the commentary on the Gospel according to Luke, the blessed Cyril says: "As a finger depends from the hand, which is not alien from it but naturally from it — so the Spirit is connected in unity with the Son by reason of consubstantiality, although it proceeds from God and the Father." But this is the same as saying: although it does not proceed from him, it is joined to him, he says, according to consubstantiality — although it does not have subsistence from him, but from God the Father.

Closing appeal of the Ephesian: Through all these things we have shown that we think consonantly with the divine scriptures and with our divine fathers and doctors, and that we change or adulterate nothing of the divine dogmas handed on to us from the beginning, add nothing, take away nothing, innovate nothing. We beseech your charity and reverence: be willing to concede together with us and with the holy fathers and doctors, and to say nothing contrary in the churches, and to be content with these alone — saying and thinking the same things — and with one heart let us glorify the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, to whom befits all glory unto the ages of ages.

CARDINAL. It remains, after the long speech that has been made, that he respond to the arguments in accordance with what was premised.

EPHESIAN. Since we think we have shown sufficiently that the addition in our book was rightly made by the great Basil — and that all those present are for us, as sufficiently having shown that that addition places no blot on the great Basil, as we assigned by interpreting the authority — we will in no way occupy ourselves with the reasons said by your paternity for the commendation of your book, since they were many and seemed to work outside the purpose; and in responding from here we would proceed to infinity. Therefore, setting those aside and giving no thought to them, we have only this to say — and we have and wish nothing other: that our book is true, as is attested both by the multitude and antiquity of the books, and by the sequence of what has been said. And we have and wish nothing further to say about that authority.

PROVINCIAL. Since the lord Ephesian says at the end that he does not have in memory the reasons said last, I will recall them to him part by part, so that he himself can satisfy the will of the Emperor, who says he must respond.

EPHESIAN. Speak briefly.

PROVINCIAL. Having said all these things to him chapter by chapter so as to satisfy him — and if he promises to acquiesce to the truth — I will approach what he said with greater readiness. He said, as we showed, that he adduced for proof — for what had been granted by concession — that even if it were true that the Spirit is *iii* in dignity, that manner of speaking used by orators — called an opposition — does not make it also necessarily *iii* in nature. For even angels, though they differ in order and dignity, are not therefore of a different nature; and star differs from star in brightness, yet the nature of the stars is not different; and there are many mansions with the Father, but not of different natures. So the Spirit, even if we were to grant it *iii* in dignity — which we conceded by supposition — need not be *iii* in nature.

On the distinction between the conditional and the absolute: But what does what you say have to do with this — that from things that are certain, what is doubtful is given? The dubious does not affirm, but that which was conceded by supposition. The consequent must follow as stated above. If it escapes your paternity that what once has been conceded conditionally we approve as certain — by the very necessity of what has been shown, we show the same by necessity. Therefore it is no wonder.

PROVINCIAL. You presuppose one thing which is against reason — namely that one thing is both conditional and non-conditional. Concerning the nature of a conditional proposition, I hold according to everyone and according to natural reason: by the manner of speaking, it never posits in existence either the antecedent or the consequent. As if I say "John is a man, John is an animal" — by this manner of speaking I can in no way understand that John is a man or an animal. So in other cases, it is not possible according to the understanding that the antecedent "if a man runs" is posited in existence; yet it follows well in the consequence that the consequent is posited in existence through the antecedent. And to say the contrary is to be ignorant of the proper natures of the conditional. Since you also cited the

conditional done at Ferrara — this is not solving but alleging an inconvenience; because ours stood so that the truth of the process might first be seen, and once had, another thing would follow — namely that we and the Roman Church could make an explanation. The consequence is that if it were granted that it does not proceed from the Son — which is what was done at Ferrara — it would be worth nothing. And therefore in your case, since you were not conceding the process except under a condition, but in our case, who have this clear truth declared by all the Greek and Latin doctors — what was done at Ferrara is a proof of necessity. Hence to allege an inconvenience is not to solve. I say therefore that, having presupposed the conditional, Basil posits the antecedent absolutely without any conditional — namely in the matter of the angels, of the mansions, and of the stars. Therefore if Basil was not ignorant — who was the light of the world — it must follow necessarily according to his manner of proceeding that whoever adds that condition is against the mind of Basil, and blackens his reputation, and that his entire proof concerning the Spirit is judged altogether invalid — unless the things posited there follow from the consequence for the confirmation of truth, not for inducing doubt in the consequent.

EPHESIAN. What was said by us — that what is said conditionally need not be taken as necessary — must stand thus. For previously in the preceding congregation I said that the assumption is that which affirms the condition. But it is clear that what is given conditionally in the consequence follows necessarily; and if what is given by condition is not necessary for what follows, that thing has itself from the order of necessity. For if a man runs, it is necessary that he moves — although it is not manifest whether the man runs. So here Basil may have conceded iii in dignity by condition.

PROVINCIAL. Add to the argument when you say "if a man runs, therefore he moves" — subjoin: "but a man runs." This is what Basil does, because he posits that second premise as certain.

EPHESIAN. I say that not even in the example is it necessary; for it is not necessary that a man run — running belongs to him contingently. Therefore if it is given that a man runs, it is necessarily given that he moves. I return to the purpose: that if through this condition "iii in dignity" were given, it is not necessary that it be "iii in nature."

PROVINCIAL. For what purpose were the examples posited?

EPHESIAN. The examples were indeed given by condition — that although they differ in dignity and order, they nonetheless do not differ in nature.

EPHESIAN. It was given conditionally that it is iii in dignity; but if this were granted, it does not necessarily follow that it is iii in nature. I believe these things are clear to all, just as it is certain that one must pray here.

PROVINCIAL. The objections are not responded to by the word "believes." Secondly, Basil makes the argument inconvertible — which is destroyed if a condition is appended. Wishing to prove the Spirit is ii from the Son in dignity and order, he makes it similarly concerning the Son toward the Father, beginning with "just as," saying that "as it is with the Son in respect to the Father, so in the Son in respect to the Spirit" — and he posits causes of this kind, which were known to him and manifest from the two preceding books, in which he showed against Eunomius that if the Son is ii in order and dignity from the Father, he is nonetheless not ii in nature, as Eunomius and the Arians said. Now, wishing to prove this about the Spirit in an argument from similarity, he posits what was proved about the Son. Now the universal rule — since it is an argument from similarity, and is called a "maxim," because of similar things the judgment is the same — this is one foundation on which the argument from similarity is based and confirmed through all theologians: if the same judgment must be in an argument from similarity, and in this proposition it says that just as the Son is related to the Father — and it is posited absolutely without condition that the Son is ii in order and dignity — therefore if the argument from similarity is to be a good one, it is necessary that the consequent be posited without condition. Otherwise he would not be arguing from similarity. Let him see what he intends to do.

On Basil's Antirrhexis: Moreover, I am astonished that the blessed Basil in the *Antirrhexis* makes a similar disputation. The chapter begins with "as the Son is related to the Father, so the Spirit to the Son" — and he proves that as the Son is the Word of the Father, and as the Father is the cause of the Son, so he says the Spirit is the Word of the Son. For whoever manifestly founds this from that authority "upholding all things by the word of his power" [Heb. 1:3] — therefore it must have itself to the Son as a cause from the Son. Nor does it follow from this

that the Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son as from two causes or from two principles, because perhaps it seems to me that he fears to confess the truth as it is in that ancient book. Because if in it it is said that the Son is the cause of the Spirit, it might follow from this that the Spirit has two causes — one need not be in doubt about this, because neither Basil intends this nor any doctor of the Latins. Indeed the Roman Church, "which has always remained immaculate," from such errors, through the working of the Lord and the blessed Peter, this see professes from long ago and most anciently that the Spirit is eternally from the Father and the Son and proceeds from the Father and the Son — not as from two principles, but from one; not from two causes, but from one. Indeed it anathematizes those who say two causes, because this would be impossible.

On the one principle of the Spirit: And this is the most evident reason: for the Father is the principle of the Son and of the Spirit, according to the co-essential divinity, and this is in the Father as communicable to the Son and to the Spirit; and therefore in communicating the essence to the Son, the Son receives the essence not as communicable to the Son — but as received — yet well as communicable to the Spirit. Because it does not conflict with the Son to be the principle by which the Spirit is produced; and because it is numerically one principle, just as there is one essence — it is numerically unique — and from this one principle it comes forth that the Spirit is produced. So it follows from this, as scripture attests: "for all that the Father has is mine" [John 16:15], and he said: "he will receive of mine." This numerically one principle makes it impossible for there to be two. Therefore, contradicting Eunomius and the Arians who were following him — who were following two principles — he wishes there to be one principle in two, and to anathematize those who say the contrary. And this Basil posits, saying: "As the Son is related to the Father in order and dignity, it does not follow that he is *ii* in nature" — because the nature is the same in both; and because it is numerically the same in both, neither is the Father the cause of the Spirit except by reason of essence, nor the Son except by reason of essence — which is communicable — and that is numerically one, given that it is received by the Son from the Father. Thus it follows that in no way are there two principles; and I wished to say this incidentally, so that he might more confidently confess the truth of our book.

On Gregory's dialogue and the diversity of books: The blessed Gregory in the dialogue says how we ought to conduct ourselves when there is diversity in books. A certain patrician Narses in Constantinople was devoted to Gregory; and since he himself had been there as legate for a long time, he wrote to him thus: that he had found at the third synod certain persons condemned, and asked how he should dispose things concerning them. The blessed Gregory consulted the synod that was at Rome and did not find those things there; and he says thus: "I doubt that it was done at this third synod as it was done at the fourth synod, because after that council, a certain Timotheus and Acacius returned to the opinion together with heretics against the Council of Chalcedon; and the first thing they did was to erase from the Chalcedonian synod what was against them, and a dissension was made until Pope Vigilius, at which time the corruption was discovered." "Let your charity examine the ancient codices of the third synod, and see if anything of the sort is to be found; and if you find anything, transmit it, and I will at once transmit it to you together with the codices."

Do not believe things haphazardly in this controversy. Even if there were a thousand false volumes, if there were some few most ancient ones — as our books are — we must give credence to this antiquity.

CARDINAL. As to the book — whether it is corrupted or not — it has been heard. There are three books: two most ancient for us, one for you. Enough for now, since the lord Ephesian was lengthy in his response.

ANDREAS. With this, the end of this contention was reached.

COLLATIO XX (FLORENTINA VII), 21 MARCH 1439

ANDREAS. On the twenty-first day of March, the disputation began, in which it was necessary to respond to the arguments of the Greeks. The Emperor opened.

EMPEROR. Our Serenity and our party were not prepared, and the Lord of Ephesus was unable to come on account of his illness, nor could I appoint anyone in his place. Because it was said to me, I arranged for all the others to come, lest I be seen to be fleeing the responses. Whatever you wish to say, say it — for our party is not prepared, and there will be no reply today.

CARDINAL. The Lord Provincial will proceed.

EMPEROR. That is agreeable.

INTERPRETER. Please speak plainly, so that the scribes may write.

PROVINCIALIS. I would have wished beyond measure that on this day the Lord of Ephesus were present, so that he might satisfy the two authorities proposed to him and hear the responses put forward by him, just as the Serenity of the Lord Emperor and he himself promised. Following the order begun between him and me, since I had undertaken to bring forward testimonies to prove this truth, I would have proceeded through all the testimonies to the end. And because he interrupted my course by introducing what he had to say, it pleased my lords that I should follow the original order and afterward come to the resolution — so that first the individual testimonies for our part in support of this truth be introduced, and approaching from these as true foundations, I may then proceed to the refutation of the things said by him. This is the proper order of procedure in this matter.

i. First, as he began, we shall begin from the foundations of Sacred Scripture. **ii.** Second, certain testimonies of our Latin doctors will be introduced, who were received with great veneration in the ancient synods. **iii.** Third, we shall introduce the testimonies of the great Greek doctors, whose authority was received in the synod. **iv.** Fourth, I shall respond to the objections which were put forward by him.

Part I: Arguments from Sacred Scripture

First Argument: The Spirit is Called "Spirit of the Son"

Regarding the first point, we find in Sacred Scripture that the Spirit is called the "Spirit of the Son," according to that passage: *"God sent the Spirit of His Son into your hearts"* (Gal. 4:6); and elsewhere: *"If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His"* (Rom. 8:9); and in the Acts of the Apostles: *"They attempted to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit of Jesus did not permit them"* (Acts 16:7); and many other similar passages in the Scriptures.

From these, the argument is made as follows. The Spirit is called the Spirit of the Son. The Spirit of the Son implies a relationship and a certain reference, and it

cannot be said that He is the Spirit of the Son only according to His humanity, but insofar as Christ is a divine person. The reason is this: if "Spirit of Christ" were said according to His humanity, He would not have the Spirit within Himself except as other holy men do. But this is false, because He was not only full of the Spirit according to His humanity — indeed, as God, He gave the Spirit to others. This is clear from the Sacred Scriptures, according to that passage of John: *"He has given us of His Spirit"* (1 John 3:24); and elsewhere in the Acts of the Apostles: *"He gave the Holy Spirit to those who fear Him"* (Acts 5:32). Now, no saint was ever found to have given the Holy Spirit; rather, it is said that they *"laid on hands and those received the Spirit"* (Acts 8:17). Therefore He could not give the Spirit except as God.

Since, therefore, it is said "Spirit of the Son," it must imply a relationship and reference to a divine person. Either this reference is one of origin, or the Spirit is called "Spirit of the Son" absolutely, without such a relationship. The latter cannot be said, because nothing is called absolutely another's except as his possession — that is, as something over which he has dominion, just as a servant is said absolutely to belong to his master. In a qualified sense, something may belong to another without that other having authority over it, as when we say: "this is my friend," "this is my brother." But when we say absolutely "this is mine," this is only said of things that are possessed. This, however, cannot be understood in divine things, because no Person is the servant of another, nor does one have dominion over another. Therefore this relationship is one of origin — such that the Spirit is called "Spirit of the Son" because He is second from the Son in dignity and order, and the Son is the principle and origin of the Spirit.

This is the first argument from Scripture, upon which are founded the testimonies of all the holy doctors, both Latin and Greek, as will appear in the testimonies to be cited.

Second Argument: The Spirit is Sent by the Father and by the Son

This is the second argument. We find in Sacred Scripture, especially in the Gospel of John, that the Spirit is sent by the Father, according to that passage: *"the Paraclete, whom the Father will send in my name"* (John 14:26); and it is found

that He is sent by the Son, in that passage: "*when the Paraclete comes, whom I will send to you*" (John 15:26).

From these the following argument is built: No one can be sent by another unless the one sending has authority over the one sent. Going through all the examples: if a lord sends a servant, it is evident that the lord has power over the servant. Likewise, counselors send a lord into battle, and in this appears the authority of greater wisdom and greater knowledge, because through their counsel he is directed. We find trees that send forth flowers and fruits, and in this origin appears, because the tree by sending forth produces something like itself, since from those seeds similar trees are generated. The first two modes are in no way found in divine things, because one Person is not more powerful than another, nor wiser than another. But it is indeed the case that one Person originates from another. Since, therefore, it is said that the Person of the Spirit is sent, it follows necessarily that this temporal mission presupposes an origin from that Person by whom He is sent. This is the second argument, founded on this text of Scripture, and upon this argument many testimonies of the holy doctors, both Greek and Latin, are adduced.

Third Argument: We are Conformed to the Son Through the Spirit

The third argument from Scripture is this: we find that through the Spirit we are conformed to the Son of God Himself. This conformation is found in the words of the Apostle in the second Epistle to the Corinthians: "*He has sealed us and anointed us and given us the pledge of the Spirit*" (2 Cor. 1:22), according to which the Spirit makes us adopted sons of the Son. From this authority the following argument is drawn: that through which something is conformed to another must have its being from that to which it is conformed.

Concerning this, there is an example in natural things, so that you may understand better: we say that the seed of an animal is that through which the offspring is made similar to the parent; now that seed must necessarily be derived from that to which the thing produced is made similar; and for this reason the seed of a man does not produce a donkey, but only a man, from whom it is derived. These are examples for this point — though not fully adequate — so that we may understand only this: that that through which something is made similar is derived from that to which it is made similar. Since, therefore, the Spirit has this property — that

through Him we are conformed to the Son — it is necessary to say that the Spirit has this from the Son.

Upon this argument certain Greek doctors greatly rely, namely Basil and Athanasius, who say that just as the Son is the image of the Father, as one existing naturally from His exemplar, so the Spirit is called the image of the Son. This appears clearly in Basil's *Against Eunomius* and in Athanasius's first letter to Serapion.

Fourth Argument: The Spirit Receives from the Son

The fourth argument, which is drawn from Scripture, comes from the words: "*He will glorify me, because He will receive of mine*" (John 16:14). For if the Spirit receives from the Son, it is necessary that He proceed from Him. It cannot be said that the Spirit receives something which He did not previously have, for that would be the nature of something indigent and mutable — which is utterly absurd to say. Whatever the Spirit received from the Son, He must have received from eternity. From this authority: if the Spirit received from the Son from eternity, it follows that He proceeded from Him from eternity.

The reason for this statement is assigned by Christ Himself, who says (following): "*All things that the Father has are mine*" (John 16:15); "*therefore I said: He will receive of mine.*" From this statement we understand that all things which the Son has, He received from eternity from the Father — therefore also the divine nature and the spirative power according to which the Spirit is breathed forth, since this spirative power in no way conflicts with Sonship, just as the nature of Father and Son is one.

If the Spirit is from eternity from the substance of the Father — that is, from the nature of the Father — it is altogether necessary to say that He is from the nature and substance of the Son as well; nor is the opposite intelligible, because He says: "*All things that the Father has are mine*" (John 16:15). And this is the reason why the Spirit "*receives from me*" — all things that do not conflict with the Son's own property, because it is relations alone that multiply in the divine, and nothing else. From this word it is grasped that the first root of this procession is the Father, and

the Son does not have from Himself the ability to produce the Spirit, but from the Father.

For this reason the doctors say that the Spirit proceeds principally from the Father, because the Son has nothing from Himself except from the Father; and this blessed Augustine explains in book **IV** of *On the Trinity*, chapter **XX**: "*When the Paraclete comes, whom I will send from the Father*" — Augustine asks why He says "from the Father," though above He said: "the Paraclete, whom the Father will send in my name," not "from me," as He said elsewhere. Augustine explains this: the Father is the principle and source of all divinity, and for this reason that Person who proceeds from the Father and the Son is sometimes referred to the Father, from whom the Son is, with no mention made of the Son — because from this it is sufficiently understood that He proceeds from the Son as well, since the Father is the first principle and origin of all divinity. The Father does not have from another the ability to produce a Person in the divine, but has it from Himself, because He is from no one. The Son, however, does not have it from Himself, because He is a Person who is from another.

Now the Father, insofar as He is Father, is not said to be the principle of the Spirit, but insofar as the divine nature dwells in Him there is spirative power; and therefore, in communicating the divine nature and spirative power to the Son, He cannot communicate the Paternity by which He is distinguished from the Son — but all those things by which He is the principle of the Spirit are communicated to the Son. He cannot, however, communicate to the Son that which would make Him the first root of divinity, because that conflicts with the property of the Son. Thus it is clear why the Spirit is said to proceed principally from the Father — not that He proceeds more fully or more perfectly from the Father than from the Son, since the Son has the same divine nature and spirative power according to which they are one principle. Nor can it be otherwise understood that they are one principle, as is clear from this: that the Spirit receives from the Son from what the Son receives from the Father, because what the Father and Son have is numerically one and the same — except that the Father has it from no one and the Son has it from the Father — and this is how it must be understood that they are one principle of the Spirit.

And yet it is said by Basil that *"the Son is second in order and dignity"* and *"the Spirit is third in dignity from the Son"* (cf. Basil, *Against Eunomius*, III, 1). You should not understand this as meaning two causes or two principles, because that very dignity by which the Father produces the Holy Spirit is the same by which the Son produces the Spirit. And this is sufficient regarding this fourth argument.

Fifth Argument: The Son Operates Through the Spirit

The fifth argument from Scripture is this. We find that the Son operates through the Spirit, according to that passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews: *"He offered Himself through the Holy Spirit"* (Heb. 9:14); and thus you will find in the testimonies to be adduced that the Son operates through the Spirit.

From this authority the following argument is formed: Whenever someone is said to operate through another, it is necessary that the one operating either gives operative power to that through whom he operates, or conversely. For example: a King operates through a bailiff — it is clear that the king gives operative power to the bailiff. Or conversely, when we say: the bailiff operates through the king, it is denoted that that through which the bailiff operates gives power to the operator himself, namely the bailiff. This is a maxim in natural philosophy.

Now, since Scripture says that the Son operates through the Spirit — as the Son performed many miracles by the power of the Spirit — it is necessary to say either that the Spirit gives operative power to the Son, or conversely. Since operative power is nothing other than the divine essence, as all the doctors hold and reason necessarily concludes, to give operative power and to give essence is the same thing. No doctor says that the Son receives essence from the Spirit, but rather the contrary. Thus from this argument, insofar as Christ is a divine Person, if He operates through the Spirit, it is necessary to say that He gives operative power and divine essence to the Spirit; and to receive essence and power is what proceeding means.

From this follows the final argument: that the holy doctors and your Greek doctors, when they say that the Spirit is from the Father through the Son, or that He breathes forth the Spirit through the Son, necessarily —

Part II: Testimonies of the Latin Doctors

Pope Leo I

— [coming now to the testimonies:] On the subject of Pope Leo I, let all understand his authority. Note the following. All the Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon, in that address delivered to the Emperor Marcian — which begins: *"This indeed ought to be our empire's concern"* — say of Leo: *"God provided for us an invulnerable champion against such error, preparing the Prelate of the Church of Rome for victory, girding him with the doctrines of truth in all things, so that, just as Peter also, striving with most fervent devotion, leads every understanding and intelligence toward God."* And the VI Council says this of Leo in its address to Constantine: *"that the roaring of the lion, roaring manfully from Rome, terrified the archimandrite beast and drove him from the monastic flock, and condemned his entire opinion."*

This doctor wrote a letter which is a pillar of the faith against all errors, divided into **XXIII** chapters. Now, even before the Council of Chalcedon, hear what he says about the procession of the Spirit — hear the most ancient text from the original.

ANDREAS. It has been read. *"Leo, bishop, to Turibius, bishop of Astorga in Spain. By the first chapter it is shown how impiously they think concerning the Holy Trinity who assert that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one and the same person, as though the same God were now called Father, [now Son, now Spirit,] and there is not one who begat, another who is begotten, another who proceeds from both — a kind of blasphemy taken from the opinion of Sabellius."*

PROVINCIALIS. From this Leo says that those think impiously concerning the Holy Trinity who say as though there were not one who begat and another who is begotten and another who proceeds from both — and thus here is the express testimony of the Pope, for he says it is impious thinking not to hold this.

Likewise, Pope Leo in his sermon on Pentecost: *"Since both the only-begotten Son is from the Father, and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Father and Son — not as any*

creature which is also of Father and Son — but as one living and powerful and eternal with both, subsisting from that which the Father and the Son are."

PROVINCIALIS. From this testimony it is very notable for what follows, because it manifestly declares how he thinks the authorities of Scripture should be understood, when he says that the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son and the Spirit of the Father — for he draws a parallel: since the Son is the only-begotten, and the Spirit is the Spirit of both Father and Son, He should not be understood as a creature from God, but as one powerful and living and eternal with both, subsisting from that which is Father and Son. Therefore, to be of the Father and Son is from the fact of subsisting from Father and Son; and what this is in the divine is the divine nature — as if to say that the Holy Spirit subsists from Father and Son.

Pope Damasus

The second testimony, which we wish to adduce, beginning from the more ancient, is Pope Damasus, of whom the Council of Chalcedon speaks thus.

GREEKS. We admit it; do not commend it to us.

[...] this book. Damasus, in letters given to Paulinus, made known the mystery dispensed. We have the book in which Pope Damasus sets forth the confession of his faith and the anathema of all heresies that had arisen. Hear from the most ancient original. *Confession of the Catholic Faith, which Pope Damasus sent to Paulinus, Bishop of Antioch: "We believe in one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, maker of visible and invisible things, through whom all things were created in heaven and on earth — this blessed Trinity of one divine name: the Father not being the Son but having a Son who is not Father; the Son not being the Father but being the Son from the Father's nature; the Paraclete Spirit being neither Father nor Son, but proceeding from the Father and the Son. Therefore the Father is unbegotten, the Son is begotten, the Paraclete is not begotten but proceeds from the Father and the Son."*

Hilary of Poitiers

Likewise, blessed Hilary, who lived in the time of your Athanasius and was a great champion of the faith alongside Athanasius, who suffered many exiles on account

of the Arians — he wrote a book *On the Trinity* in the time of Athanasius, divided into **XII** books.

Hear what he says in book **VIII** of *On the Trinity*: "*Nor in this do I find fault with the freedom of understanding, whether they think the Paraclete Spirit is from the Father or from the Son; for the Lord did not leave the matter uncertain. For speaking with the same words He said: 'I still have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. When the Spirit of truth comes, He will guide you into all truth; for He will not speak of Himself, but whatever He hears He will speak and will announce things to come. He will glorify me, because He will receive of mine; all things that the Father has are mine; therefore I said: He will receive of mine and announce it to you.'* And now I ask: is it not the same to receive from the Son and to proceed from the Father?"

PROVINCIALIS. I say, on account of this: God Himself says "He will receive of mine" — this that He receives, whether it be power, or virtue, or teaching, He says it is to be received from the Son; and again He signifies that it is to be received from the Father. This unity has no diversity; nor does it differ from whom it is received — what is given by the Father is seen to be given by the Son as well.

PROVINCIALIS. In book **III** he says: "*Concerning the Spirit it is proper neither to be silent nor necessary to speak at length, for we confess — the Father and Son being the authors — that He is breathed forth by Father and Son and proceeds from both.*"

PROVINCIALIS. And at the end of the book a prayer is offered: "*Preserve, I pray, this undefiled religion of my faith, and grant to my spirit until its departure this voice of my conscience: that what I have professed in the creed of regeneration, baptized in the name of Father, Son, and Spirit, I may always hold — namely, that I adore You, Father, and the Son together with You, and Your Holy Spirit, who proceeds from You and through Your only-begotten One, that I may be worthy — He who is a fitting witness to me of the faith, saying: Father, all things that are mine are Yours and Yours are mine.*"

Jerome

PROVINCIALIS. Likewise blessed Jerome, who lived at that time, shows in three letters that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

In the first letter to Damasus: *"We believe in one God the Father Almighty, and in our one Lord Jesus, Son of God, and in the Holy Spirit God — not three gods, but we worship and confess Father, Son, and Spirit as one God; not as one solitary being, not the same who is both Father and Son to Himself, but the Father who begat and the Son who is begotten, and the Spirit who is truly neither begotten nor unbegotten, neither created nor made, but proceeding from Father and Son, coequal with Father and Son."*

PROVINCIALIS. Likewise Jerome, writing to Augustine and Alypius, begins: *"Let us believe; for from the Son the Father is called Father, and He who was always Father always had a Son. Let us believe in the Holy Spirit, true God, proceeding from Father and Son, equal in all things to Father and Son in will, eternity, and substance."*

PROVINCIALIS. Jerome in his exposition of the Nicene Creed speaks thus — Jerome first sets forth the Creed, and then when the part about the Spirit comes, he expounds and says: *"And in the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who is true God just as the Son also is."*

PROVINCIALIS. This Jerome was a disciple of your Gregory of Nazianzus, and received his teaching from him.

Ambrose of Milan

Next came Ambrose, Archbishop of Milan, who lived in the time of Basil, that is in the times of Valens, Valentinian, and Gratian, who preceded him. This great father and doctor wrote three books to Gratian: the first against the Arians, on the Trinity; the second on the Holy Spirit, against the Macedonians; the third on questions concerning the Spirit, to the same Emperor Gratian. Hear what he says.

How greatly he was esteemed at the **III** Synod, the great acts make clear; and when Theodosius returned from Italy to Constantinople, he said to the Nazianzene: *"beside this one ... bishop indeed Ambrose."*

Hear what he says in book **I** of *On the Holy Spirit*, chapter **X**: "*From every place therefore the Spirit is sent, or proceeds as if from a place, when He proceeds from the Son, just as when the Son says: 'I proceeded and came from the Father'"* (John 8:42). And further in the same chapter: "*The Holy Spirit also, when He proceeds from the Father and from the Son, is not separated from the Father, not separated from the Son. How could He be separated from the Father, who is the Spirit of His mouth?"* (cf. Ps. 32:6).

PROVINCIALIS. This is a sufficiently clear testimony, and it draws its foundation from Scripture when it says "the Spirit of His mouth," just as Basil and other saints, from this authority of Scripture — "the Spirit of His mouth" — and from other authorities, conclude that He proceeds from the Son.

Likewise, how this text of John should be understood — "*He will not speak of Himself, and what the Father has, the Son has*" — Ambrose illuminates the order, just as Basil did against Eunomius, and thus declares in this text.

Likewise Ambrose says in book **II** to Gratian *On the Spirit*, chapter **XI**: "*What, therefore, is meant by: 'He will not speak of Himself'? This is: He does not speak without me, for I speak truth; He breathes forth wisdom. He does not speak without the Father, for He is the Spirit of God. He does not hear of Himself, for from God the Father the Son received all things, since He Himself said: 'All things have been handed over to me by my Father' (Mt. 11:27). The Son has all the things of the Father, for He says: 'All things that the Father has are mine' (John 16:15); and what He Himself receives through the unity of nature from the Son Himself, through the same unity of nature the Holy Spirit has received, as John declares of the Son Himself, when he says concerning the Spirit: 'Therefore I said: because He will receive of mine and will announce it to you'"* (John 16:14).

PROVINCIALIS. Note here, because he says: "He does not hear of Himself, for from Him He received all things" — he sets forth the order from the Father of the Son; and what the Son received through unity of nature, through the same unity the Son also received. And just as the Son has Himself absolutely in order and dignity, because He received, so this great doctor says that the Spirit absolutely receives from the Son. It should not be believed that the Spirit would speak otherwise in Basil and in Ambrose, since they were of the same time.

Likewise, Ambrose speaks of the source of the Spirit — and says this in book **I** to Gratian *On the Holy Spirit*, chapter **XVIII**: *"Understand now that just as the Father is the fountain of life (Ps. 35:10), so the Son is the fountain of life, because with You, Almighty God, Your Son is the fountain of life — that is, the fountain of the Holy Spirit."*

PROVINCIALIS. This clear doctor in his second work on the Holy Spirit and in the first book also makes this plainly clear, saying that what proceeds from the interior of God is not a creature of God but is proved to be the substance of God. Read his words: *"When you ask how He is companion and equal to the King, when He is manifestly of royal honor and lineage? Therefore, because the Spirit proceeds from both, He says: 'But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His' (Rom. 8:9); and in another place: 'He breathed and said: Receive the Spirit'"* etc. (John 20:22–23).

PROVINCIALIS. From this authority we ought to draw one point: in assigning the reason why He proceeds from both, Ambrose says only this — because it is written: *"If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ"* etc. And this relationship of the Spirit, because He is called "Spirit of the Son," is derived from the fact that He proceeds from both. This I had already said in the first argument.

Likewise, in the same book, in the final chapter: *"What is it that the Son is said to be born from God, and the Spirit is signified to proceed? If you ask what the difference is between the one born and the one proceeding, the answer is plainly this: because the one is born from one, and the other proceeds from both."* And in the same chapter: He is said to be sent by Father and Son, so that He may be recognized as proceeding from their substance and acting in unity with them.

Pope Hormisdas

After blessed Augustine, before the times of Gregory the Dialogist, there was Pope Hormisdas, who lived in the time of Emperor Justin, who preceded the great Justinian. At that time the Church of Constantinople was troubled on account of the heretical Patriarch Acacius and certain followers of Eutyches, after the Council of Chalcedon. Wherefore John of Constantinople, succeeding and working toward the reconciliation of that Church with the Roman Church, conducted great negotiations

— which we have here. And Justin agreed with John that the whole Church should receive the faith that Hormisdas would send, so that from agreement in faith there might come agreement in obedience. Hormisdas composed a tome of faith, sending it to John and Justin and to that whole Church; and other patriarchs through him received the tome of the faith of Hormisdas.

These are the words from the letter to Justin: *"Great and incomprehensible is the mystery of the Trinity. God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit — undivided Trinity; and yet it is known that it is proper to the Father to beget the Son, proper to the Son of God to be born from the Father as equal to the Father, proper to the Spirit to proceed from the Father and Son under one substance of the Godhead."*

Gregory the Dialogist

Now follow the authorities of Gregory the Dialogist, who came after the V Synod in the time of Emperor Maurice. Hear what he says.

In the *Pastoral*, in the creed: *"I believe in one God, I pray to the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, neither begotten nor unbegotten, but coeternal, proceeding from Father and Son."*

Likewise, book **II** of the *Moralia*, chapter **XXVII**: *"The Truth itself, to increase faith, said to the disciples: 'If I do not go away, the Paraclete will not come to you' (John 16:7). Since it is agreed that the Paraclete proceeds from Father and Son, He says the Son will withdraw, so that He who does not withdraw from the Son may come."*

Likewise, Gregory, book **I** of the *Moralia*: *"Since the Redeemer prayed for the apostles returning from preaching, He is said to sanctify by sending, because when He bestows the Spirit — who proceeds from Himself — upon the hearts of the disciples, whatever guilt there may have been was cleansed."*

Likewise, the same, book **II** of the *Moralia*: *"The Spirit comes to all the faithful, but only in the one Mediator does He remain always in a singular way — He did not desert Him in His humanity, from whose divinity He proceeds."*

Likewise, book **XXX** of the *Moralia*: *"The hour comes when I will no longer speak to you in proverbs, but I will announce plainly about the Father" (John 16:25); He declares that He will announce plainly about the Father, because through the Father He will then reveal the form of His own majesty — from whom by the very act of His begetting He arises as not unequal — and He shows how the Spirit, coeternal with both, proceeds from both."*

Boethius

PROVINCIALIS. Now, because in the time of Emperor Justin there flourished a certain doctor, Boethius, who wrote books in theology *On the Trinity* against the Arians, another *On the Two Natures in Christ* against Nestorius and Eutyches, and one *On the Catholic Faith*, and many other things in philosophy and theology for the doctors of the Greek and Latin tongue — this is what he says in his book *On Faith and the Trinity*:

"This religion, which is called Christian and Catholic, rests on these foundations, asserting that from eternity — that is, before the foundation of the world, before the existence of what can be retained in the word of time — the divine substance of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit existed; so that He calls God the Father and the Son, God the Holy Spirit — not three gods but one. The Father has from His substance a Son begotten coeternal with Him by a reason known to Himself" — "the faith professes that He Himself is the one who is Father, nor was the Father ever the Son, lest the human mind again think of divine generation as going on to infinity; nor does the Son, in that nature by which He is coeternal with the Father, ever become the Father, lest again the divine progeny extend to infinity. The Spirit is neither Father nor Son, and therefore in that nature neither begotten nor begetting, but proceeding from Father and Son."

Likewise in the book *On the Trinity*, at the end: *"And if we remember all that was said previously concerning God, let us think that the Son indeed proceeded from God the Father, and the Spirit from both."*

Isidore of Seville

PROVINCIALIS. Also in the time of the blessed Gregory the Dialogist there flourished in Spain a theologian named Isidore, who published many volumes on

sacred Scripture. I will cite one testimony from him. He wrote a book of *Etymologies* divided into **XXII** books. In book **VII**, chapter **iii**, he says: *"This is the difference between the Son who is born and the Spirit who proceeds: the Son is born from one, and the Spirit proceeds from both. Hence it is said: 'If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His'"* (Rom. 8:9).

From this statement and from all the testimonies cited above you can conclude that all testimonies which say the Spirit proceeds from the Son make their foundation in the authorities of Scripture which say that He is the Spirit of the Son — understanding that authority as one that the Spirit must be held to possess.

The Spanish Councils

And because shortly after this doctor the whole land of the Spains, along with their king Reccared (who had been an Arian, as had his predecessors), after the heresy of the Arians had been refuted and anathematized, the whole land received the faith; and it was necessary for several councils to be held in their territory, so that the people might be more easily instructed in the faith by frequent celebration of councils. These councils were of great authority, since they were held before the **VI** Synod and before the **I** Synod in the time of Leo; and as it is written, the Council of Chalcedon accepted the Council of Sardica against the remnants of Arius (at the time of which council was Ossius of Córdoba, the Pope's own Ossius), and the Council of Chalcedon accepted the particular council against Apollinaris, in which some things about the faith were said against the heretics.

Thus the Roman Church, the Apostolic See, and the whole universal Church, Greek and Latin, received those councils with great veneration. And there the following was composed as the norm of Catholic faith — the rule of the Catholic faith which the bishops of Tarragona, Carthage, Lusitania, and Baetica composed and sent with a precept of Pope Leo of the city of Rome to Balconius, bishop of Galicia:

"We believe in the true God, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, maker of visible and invisible things, through whom all things were created in heaven and on earth — one God the Father, the Son to be one, but having the Spirit who is not the

Father; the Son not being the Father, but the Son born from the Father; the Spirit who is neither Father nor Son, but proceeding from Father and Son."

Likewise in the **III** Council: *"The Holy Spirit ... is to be confessed as proceeding from Father and Son, and as being of one substance with Father and Son."*

Likewise in another council, where heretics are anathematized: *"Whoever does not believe the Spirit to proceed from Father and Son, and does not say He is one with Father and Son and consubstantial — let him be anathematized."*

Likewise in another synod: *"We believe the Holy Spirit, the life-giver, to proceed from Father and Son, and to be consubstantially one — who proceeds from both. The Father we profess as made by none; the Son as not made by the Father but begotten; the Spirit as neither created nor begotten, but proceeding from Father and Son."*

Likewise in the following synod: *"The Holy Spirit, neither begotten nor created, but proceeding from Father and Son and consubstantially one — who proceeds from both."*

Likewise in another synod: *"We believe the Holy Spirit, the life-giver, to proceed from Father and Son, to be worshipped and glorified together with Father and Son."*

Likewise in the **XII** Synod of Toledo: *"The Father is the source of all divinity; the Father Himself, who from His ineffable substance ineffably begat the Son — and begat none other than what He Himself is — and the Holy Spirit likewise, who is the third Person in the Trinity, not however begotten or created, but proceeding from both."*

Likewise in the **XIII** Synod: *"We believe the Holy Spirit, the life-giver, proceeding from Father and Son, to be glorified together with Father and Son."*

PROVINCIALIS. All these synods were received before the **VI** Synod with great veneration. And if the Church, in matters of faith, gives authority to individual doctors — as appears in many sessions of the **IV** Synod — all the more has she given such authority to synods of this kind, assembled by the authority of the

Apostolic See and confirmed by that same see, in which great doctors were present, as is said of the Council of Carthage held before the **III** Synod, which condemned Pelagius; likewise, councils that declare against errors which arise are approved. There are many doctors in our Church who have declared this matter plainly, whom for now we omit, so that we may all agree on those well-known figures, both Greek and Latin, who lived before the **VII** Synod.

So the second part is completed, in which we had said that we would adduce certain testimonies of the Latin doctors for the truth. I had said we would enter, in the third place, upon the Greek doctors — even their own — who are held in great veneration, who declare this truth like thunderbolts. And therefore we shall enter upon this third part.

Session of 24 March 1439

ANDREAS. On the twenty-fourth day of March another assembly was held, the seventh public session. The Provincial began.

PROVINCIALIS. Following the order first established, we pass on to the authorities of the holy Greek doctors, so that from those testimonies the truth held by both the holy Latin and Greek doctors may become known.

Part III: Testimonies of the Greek Doctors

Basil the Great

After the authorities previously cited, there are also other testimonies of the great Basil, by which he shows that the same order exists between the Spirit and the Son as exists between the Son and the Father. For in the book called *Against the Refuters (Antirhetika)*, in the chapter *Those who share in the Creator are made in His image*, he says that "*the Son is the image of God and the image of the Son is the Spirit, and those who share in Him are conformed to the Son*" — according to that word of the Apostle: "*Those whom He predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son*" (Rom. 8:29).

From this it is grasped that just as the Son is called the image of the Father, so the Spirit is the image of the Son. The term "image," according to the teaching of all

the holy fathers, implies procession in the likeness of another; and this is established from the text of divine Scripture, where Wisdom — or Scripture speaking of divine Wisdom — says in Wisdom, chapter VII: *"It is a certain emanation of the brightness of the Almighty God and an image of His goodness as it emanates"* (Wis. 7:25), and it implies procession.

Therefore it is impossible for anything to be an image of another without proceeding in its likeness. That from which the image proceeds is called the exemplar. In the divine realm, the Spirit cannot be the image of the Son unless it is a natural image; therefore the Son receives by this the nature from the Father. Because He receives nature, He is therefore called His image. Since the Spirit also proceeds naturally — because the divine nature is communicated and given to Him and He is called the image of the Son — it is therefore necessary that He receive nature and being from the Son.

And since Basil here posits no contradiction, it follows manifestly that no qualifying condition ought to have been placed in the first book either.

Likewise, Basil in the *Antirhetika*, in another chapter — but let the first authority be read first in Greek.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. The chapter begins, which I was just speaking of: *"As the Son stands in relation to the Father, so the Spirit stands in relation to the Son."* And therefore he immediately adds: *"The Son is called the Word of the Father and the Spirit of the Son, according to that word of the Apostle: 'bearing all things by the word of His power'"* (Heb. 1:2). Now since the Word of the Father proceeds from Him and receives being from Him as from His cause and principle — and here Basil posits that in the same manner the Word of the Son relates to the Son Himself, because the Spirit is the Word of the Son, as he himself proves, and he places no contradiction here — if we grant this, then he grants that the Spirit proceeds from the Son and that the Son is the cause.

ANDREAS. This authority was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. There would be many other testimonies of the great Basil, but since there are many others still to come, let these concerning Basil suffice.

Epiphanius

And since at the beginning we made mention of that holy father Epiphanius and brought forward two testimonies, it remains to adduce two other testimonies from him in that *Ancoratus* which we cited on another occasion. After those testimonies he draws the following conclusion: *"And so the Father always was, and the Son always was, and the Holy Spirit breathed forth from Father and Son."* Now since the breathing-forth of the Spirit in the divine is nothing other than the procession of the Spirit — indeed it is a notional act with respect to the Spirit — and here he says that He is breathed forth by Father and Son, it follows that He proceeds from Father and Son.

ANDREAS. This authority was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Likewise this father Epiphanius, in a certain book entitled *Against the Heretics*, says: *"But if Christ is believed to be God from God out of the Father, and the Spirit out of Christ — or from both — as Christ says: 'who proceeds from the Father' (John 15:26) 'and He will receive of mine'" (John 16:14).*

From this a clear parallel appears with the statements of Basil, without any condition whatsoever, so that nothing could be clearer. He says: if Christ is believed to be God from God out of the Father — as all believe, and this is nothing other than to say that God proceeds from God — so likewise he says: *"we ought to believe the Spirit to be out of Him, so that He is God from God — or from both"* — says Epiphanius.

For it is the same thing to say in relation to God that the Spirit is God from God out of Him, and that He is from both. And that this is so, he proves by two authorities of Sacred Scripture: first, that He is God from God out of the Father — from that passage *"who proceeds from the Father"* (John 15:26); second, that He is the Spirit God from God out of Him — proved from that passage: *"He will receive of mine"* (John 16:14).

And since he places this without any condition, this holy father ought certainly to have seen blessed Basil — or, if he preceded Basil, then Basil ought to have seen him. Therefore it is of necessity to say that the qualifying condition cannot stand in that book.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. So that we may proceed according to the order of times — since many other authorities could be adduced from holy Epiphanius — we believe these to suffice concerning him, and let us pass on to others.

Didymus of Alexandria

We have, translated into Latin by blessed Jerome, the book of the great Didymus *On the Holy Spirit*. This Didymus was the teacher of Jerome, and Jerome himself says of him in his letter to Amachius and Pammachius that though his head was already sprinkled with the white of age, and it was more fitting for him to be a master than a student, he nonetheless journeyed to Alexandria to hear Didymus. And your own historians — namely Theodoret and Socrates — speak immense praise of his learning.

He says thus: *"The Holy Spirit also, being the Spirit of truth and the Spirit of wisdom, cannot, when the Son is speaking, hear things which He does not know, since what the Spirit subsists upon is what is uttered by the Son"* (Didymus, *De Spiritu sancto*, c. 36). And a little further he says: *"Nor is the Son anything other than what is given to Him by the Father, nor is the substance of the Holy Spirit anything other than what is given by the Son."*

From this authority it appears first that the relationship of the Spirit to the Son is the same as that of the Son to the Father, because he says that the Son is nothing other than what is given to Him by the Father. Now nothing is given to the Son by the Father except eternally, because otherwise it would be given in time and He would be mutable. And this is held in holy John the Evangelist, who declares what it is that is given to the Son by the Father. He says in chapter X: *"My sheep hear my voice and follow me, and I give them eternal life, and no one can snatch them from my hand. I and the Father are one"* (John 10:27–30). That which is greater than all things, by reason of which no one can snatch His sheep either from Him or

from the Father, and according to which Father and Son are one — this is nothing other than the divine substance and essence, as all the holy doctors expound.

Where holy Didymus says that the Son is nothing other than what is given to Him by the Father, and the Spirit is no other substance than what is given to Him by the Son — thus there is no place for any condition. And it ought to be believed that Basil also saw this work *On the Holy Spirit*; therefore that doubtful condition ought not to have been placed there.

In the first authority he says that the Spirit cannot hear what He does not know when the Son is speaking, since the Spirit subsists upon what is uttered by the Son. From this it appears that the Spirit's "hearing" from below is nothing other than the reception of knowledge; and since knowledge in God and essence are one, this hearing and this knowledge will be one. And therefore Christ said humanly in the Gospel: *"He will not speak of Himself"* (John 16:13), because He is not from Himself; therefore it is necessary that He receive from Him from whom He hears. From Him whom He hears, from Him He proceeds — according to Augustine. And he says: *"His hearing is his knowing, and knowing is the same as being"* — as Augustine has expounded. From which it follows: from Him from whom He hears, from Him He has being. But He hears from the Son — as has been conceded here and was first conceded by you — therefore He receives being from the Son. That knowledge is eternal, and that hearing is like the essence, as Augustine explains.

Athanasius

Since Athanasius flourished in the time of this Didymus, I will come to the testimonies of the great and most blessed Athanasius.

He says in book **iii** *Against the Arians*, speaking of the Son: *"He Himself, as has been said, gives the Spirit, and whatever the Spirit has, He has from the Word"* (Athanasius, *Oratio iii contra Arianos*, c. 22). And since He has nothing except eternally, and the Spirit has this from the Son, it therefore necessarily follows that He proceeds from the Son.

ANDREAS. The authority of Athanasius was read.

PROVINCIALIS. This doctor Athanasius says in book i *Against the Arians*: "*For all other things participate in the Spirit, but He Himself — according to you* (speaking to the Arians) *— in whom will the Son share? And the Spirit Himself receives more from the Son, and it is irrational to say that the Son is sanctified by Him.*" Therefore it appears that the Spirit receives from the Son and that in no way can the Son be sanctified by the Spirit, because the Son Himself is God and produces the Holy Spirit, and whatever the Holy Spirit works, He works as one produced by the Son — and this is what he says.

ANDREAS. This authority was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Likewise this doctor Athanasius, in a certain letter in which he expounds those words "*Whoever shall have spoken a word against the Holy Spirit*" (Mt. 12:32), says: "*For He taught that all things that the Father has are the Son's, and the Spirit will receive from the Son; for He says: 'He will receive of mine'*" (John 16:14) *'and He will glorify the Son'; and the Son will not be given the Spirit, but the Son presents the Spirit to the disciples.*" From this authority it is gathered that the meaning is: He will receive from the Son — and he expounds this openly.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Likewise this doctor, in the fourth letter to Serapion, which begins "*Perhaps you will wonder,*" says: "*Even if the Spirit is the Son's and receives all things from the Son, as He Himself says: 'He breathed and gave Him to the disciples'*" (John 20:22–23). He says three things. First, that He is the Spirit of the Son; and from this relationship he says that He receives all things from the Son — as all the Latin doctors say. And from the fact that He receives all things from the Son through eternal procession, because in no other way can He receive anything. Second, he says that He gives Him to the disciples temporally; therefore every temporal procession presupposes eternal procession.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Likewise this doctor Athanasius, in the third letter to Serapion, near the beginning — which begins "*I have read, and now*" — says: "*Because, as the Lord says, the Paraclete does not speak of Himself, but whatever He shall have heard He will speak, because 'He will receive of mine and announce it to you'*"

(John 16:13–14); *and breathing upon them He gave Him to the disciples* (John 20:22–23), *so the Father poured Him out upon all flesh according to Scripture; and therefore it was rightly said and written first of the Son of God Himself, so that from the knowledge of the Son we may also rightly have knowledge of the Spirit.*"

And in this you see how Basil imitates the form of Athanasius, because Athanasius says in these words that it was necessary first to deal with the Son for the reasons stated, so that from the truth of what had been said about the Son, what had been said about the Spirit might become clear. Basil did the same against Eunomius, and he makes a comparison that is very noteworthy: *"The relationship that we know the Son to have to the Father, this we will find the Spirit to have to the Son"* (cf. Ps.-Basil, *Contra Eunomium*, lib. V). And afterward he declares how these relationships should be understood, saying: *"Just as the Son says: 'All things that the Father has are mine' (John 16:15), so we will find all these things to be through the Son"* — see how, showing the parallel of reception, he declares that the Son receives all from the Father, and is second in order and dignity; all these things cannot be in the Spirit except through the Son, because with God, to receive from the Son or through the Son is the same thing, though the manner of speaking may vary.

He then makes another comparison: *"Just as the Father shows the Son, saying: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased' (Mt. 3:17), so the Spirit is of the Son, as the Apostle says: 'God sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father'"* (Gal. 4:6).

Hence all the Latin doctors, as you have heard, say that from the fact that the Spirit is called the Spirit of the Son, a natural relationship of the Spirit is implied — just as from the fact that He is called Son of the Father, a relationship of natural origin from the Father is implied. And this same thing is said here by Athanasius.

ANDREAS. The authority was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Here blessed Athanasius, a little before this authority in the same letter, says: *"Since the Son is one, the living Word, there ought to be one perfect and full sanctifying and illuminating life, which is His operation and gift; and this also is said to proceed from the Father, because it shines forth, is sent, and*

given by that Word which we confess to have being from the Father." See from this authority how he openly tells us that the very operation and gift is from the Son, and proceeds from the Father for this reason and on this basis — because it shines forth and is sent by that Word which has being from the Father. Therefore it appears that it cannot be from the Father except through the Word.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Likewise Athanasius in the same letter: *"When Paul says: 'I testify before God in Christ Jesus' (2 Tim. 4:1), he knew that the Spirit was not divided from the Son, but was in Christ, as the Son is in the Father."* Now the Son is in the Father as in His principle and cause; therefore the Spirit is in Christ as in His principle and cause.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Likewise this doctor, in the book *On the Incarnation of the Word*, says: *"Therefore David, singing in the Psalms, sang: 'For with You is the fountain of life and in Your light we shall see light'" (Ps. 35:10).* He knew that with the Father is the Son, the fountain of the Holy Spirit. As a river proceeds from a fountain, so the Spirit — who is called the Spirit of the Son — proceeds from the fountain, Christ. Because so says Athanasius openly, and the great Ambrose, as was cited yesterday. Athanasius says further, whom I cited on another occasion in this matter. Let the first authority be read first in Greek.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. He says thus in the dialogue held at Nicaea against Arius: *"For if the Spirit is not from the substance of the Father and the Son, why did God include Him in the creed of sanctification, saying: 'Go, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit'?" (Mt. 28:19).* Therefore from this authority it is manifestly grasped — and from what follows at length — that the Spirit is from the substance of the Father and Son.

And recently the Lord of Ephesus responded thus: the Spirit is from the substance of the Father and Son, that is, of one substance with Father and Son — and in this way he wished to exclude the order of natural origin and place only an order in

words. This exposition can in no way stand, because if we say that the Holy Spirit is from the substance of the Father and Son because He is one in substance, we could equally say that the Father is from the substance of the Holy Spirit, because He is of one substance with the Spirit; and likewise that the Son is from the substance of the Spirit, because He is of one substance with Him. But this would be utterly absurd, and all doctors would recoil from it, nor has it ever been accepted that anyone should say that the Father is from the substance of the Spirit, or the Son. The preposition "from" (*de*) implies both principle and consubstantiality; and to say "from the substance of the Son" is as much as to say "from the Son substantially" or "the Son produces Him substantially."

ANDREAS. The authority was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Many other testimonies could be brought forward from blessed Athanasius, and from these most ancient and venerable books. But so that other doctors may have their place, let blessed Cyril succeed — who in my judgment was greatly elevated in genius.

Cyril of Alexandria

Let us begin from his letter which he composed at the Synod of Alexandria and which was afterward approved at the Synod of Ephesus, and likewise received at Chalcedon — the letter which begins: "*With our Savior*" etc. This whole letter is directed against the Nestorians. They sinned chiefly in two respects: first, concerning the incarnation of the Son, because they did not say there was one divine person in two natures; second, they sinned against the Spirit — for, as appears in the altered creed, they said that the Spirit was not of the Son and did not receive essence from the Son.

They were compelled to say this because the thing by which it appeared in the world that Christ was God were the great miracles surpassing all natural power; and therefore those Nestorians, who said He was a mere man, said that He worked by an alien power — and consequently that the Spirit did not receive essence from the Son, because if He had received essence from the Son, then the Son would not have worked by an alien power but by His own, which proceeded from Himself, according to the Gospel: "*Power went out from Him and healed all*" (Luke 6:19).

This Cyril made not only one chapter among those **XII** against the opinion of Nestorius concerning the Spirit — as will appear in the responses to the final argument of the Ephesian — but in the letter *"With our Savior"* he argues very forcefully against Nestorius. He begins from the Spirit and says that those who understand rightly should not understand that He was glorified by the Spirit as by an alien power, because the Spirit is neither superior to the Son nor beyond His essence. He then declares how this should be understood, refuting Nestorius's opinion by saying that for the demonstration of His divinity, He used His own Spirit in great things — as if one were to say, concerning things among us, that someone glorified himself by strength or discipline innate to him, or by anything of the sort. For if someone in the world were glorified by strength innate to him naturally, so we ought to understand that the Spirit was a power innately and naturally belonging to the Son Himself and naturally going out from Him, according to which Christ is glorified by working miracles.

And he says that although the Spirit exists in His own subsistence and is understood as Spirit — not Son — yet He is not alien from Him. And it should be noted that in another letter, which he wrote to John of Antioch, which begins *"Let the heavens rejoice,"* he says: *"He is not alien from the Son according to the principle of one essence."* Now blessed Cyril does not intend to say only this — that He is not alien by reason of being of one essence with Him, as the Ephesian seemed to expound — but he immediately attaches how the Son is the principle of the Holy Spirit, assigning the reason why He is not alien from Him, saying: *"The Spirit of truth"* (John 14:17) *is named,* and Christ is the truth; therefore He is called not alien from this reason, because He is called the Spirit of truth. And he understands this relationship of the genitive case as natural origin from the Son, just as the Latin doctors do; and he immediately adds: *"and He flows forth from Him, as from God the Father"* — because there is no other reason why He is the Spirit of truth except that He flows forth from Him as from the Father.

And this is as clear a testimony as could exist in the world, because He flows forth from Christ as from the Father. And so just as He proceeds from the Father naturally, and is sent temporally, so likewise He is sent temporally from the Son — and necessarily in that way He proceeds from Him eternally. And lest anyone say that "flowing forth" (*profluere*) is not the same as "proceeding" (*procedere*), you

ought not to believe anyone more than Cyril himself, because he himself declares that "to flow forth" is the same as "to proceed." And he shows this in a certain work on the creed of the Council of Nicaea, where speaking of belief in the Spirit, he says: *"After completing the discourse about Christ, the most blessed fathers remembered to believe in the Spirit Himself and said, as in the Father and in the Son; He is consubstantial and flows forth indeed — that is, proceeds — as from a fountain from God the Father."*

He therefore declares that "to proceed" and "to flow forth" are the same; and since here he says that He flows forth from the Son, it is of necessity to say, according to this opinion set forth in the letter beginning *"With our Savior"* — which was received by the **iii** Synod and the Chalcedonian — that the Spirit proceeds from the Son just as from the Father.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. From this I say again: if the holy Nicene fathers... Let the authority of *"With our Savior"* be read.

CARDINAL. *"The Spirit of truth is named, and Christ is the truth, and He flows forth from Him as from God the Father."*

PROVINCIALIS. Now I make this conclusion. The fathers concluded thus against the heresy of Nestorius, who said that the Spirit did not receive essence from the Son. Now in the Council of Chalcedon you have the testimony of those fathers that the great Pope Leo was in all things instructed in the doctrines of truth; and in that pillar of faith against the Priscillianists he says: *"One who begat, and another who is begotten, and another who proceeds from both."* And the whole Council of Chalcedon approved the teaching of Leo; it approved this letter of Cyril against the error of Nestorius. Therefore we can conclude as true — established and confirmed by two ecumenical synods — that the Spirit receives essence from the Son and proceeds from both, because to proceed and to receive essence from the Son are the same, as I have said many times.

Likewise, Cyril in the work *To Hermias*, where he wishes to show the procession of the divine persons from within, in the first book says: *"Understand the supreme root — beyond which no one goes — as the Father; and Him who proceeds from*

the supreme root you will accept as the Son, who in all and every respect excels in equal measure, except for begetting alone — this is proper and particular to God the Father Himself. You will call the Holy Spirit Him who flows forth naturally from the Father through the Son and, as it were in the figure of a breath, from the mouth insinuates His own substance to us."

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Now in this notable authority, when he sets forth the production of the Son, he says *"that He excels the Father in all and every respect in equal measure, except for begetting alone."* Now in the Father there are two things: there is spiration, which breathes forth the Spirit, and there is generation. Now Cyril says that in all things the Son is equal to the Father and in the same measure with respect to everything, except this one thing — that He begets. Since, therefore, the relation of procession and generation are distinct things, he necessarily holds that spiration is communicated to the Son, and that He is altogether equal to the Father in the spiration of the Spirit.

Second, he says that this Holy Spirit flows forth naturally from the Father through the Son. And it has long since been shown that it is impossible to proceed through the Son without proceeding from the Son. Indeed, all our doctors and yours very rarely — or never — say "through the Son," but always "from the Son"; and the reason is that although the meaning is the same, there is a difference in mode of signifying. Lest anyone ever be able to believe from this that the Son is an instrument through which the Father produces the Spirit — as the Arians said — the doctors take care not to say this unless there is some necessity of explanation, as was the case at that time against the Arians.

Now this "flowing forth" is natural; but according to the path of all the wise and theologians, that which proceeds naturally from something proceeds in the likeness of nature from it and receives nature from it. And so this term "flows forth" (*profluit*) is taken to mean the eternal procession, according to which the Spirit receives nature from the Son and from the Father.

Likewise, Cyril in the second book *To Hermias*, wishing to show that the external works of divinity are undivided and that both the Son and the Father work in the

creature through the Spirit's working, adducing the authority "*every best gift*" (Jas. 1:17) and this other word of Christ when He said to the disciples: "*Heal the sick, raise the dead*" (Mt. 10:7–8) — so he says: "*John confessed: 'From His fullness we have all received'*" (John 1:16); and then he adds to Hermias: "*Will the best gift and the perfect gift be anything other than, as seems to you, the participation of the Spirit?*" Hermias replied: "*By no means.*" Cyril says: "*Look to us, friend, at the Son producing from His own fullness His own Holy Spirit — immovably implanted in Him — through whom every best gift.*"

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek by the General of the Camaldolese, who read all these authorities cited this day in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Now if the Son produces the Spirit who is His own, I do not know what greater authority there could be that the Spirit proceeds from Him.

Likewise, Cyril in his *Thesaurus*, through many testimonies, approves this matter; of these I will cite a few, on account of the brevity of time. He says in a certain place: "*The Spirit says: 'Set apart for me Paul and Barnabas for the work for which I have chosen them'*" (Acts 13:2); the Spirit calling them by a sign to the apostolate — calling them from Christ — he says openly: "*It is taught that the Spirit is not alien in substance from the Son, but in Him and from Him there comes a certain natural operation capable of filling all things that He wills.*"

From this authority you have one singular point against the exposition of the Lord of Ephesus, because here he makes it understood that the Spirit is not alien from His substance — meaning: He is not alien from His substance in this way — and he infers that He is the principle, when he says: "*and in Him and from Him,*" making it clear that He is thus. And so, when Cyril posits that the Spirit is not alien from the Son in substance, he always means by this that He is from the Son Himself substantially. And this has been said many times above, and this is evident.

ANDREAS. He read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. The same doctor says thus in the same work in the *Thesaurus*: "*Since therefore the Son is life according to nature, the Spirit who is granted from*

Him gives life; it is necessary to confess that He is from the substance of the Son and has all His power and operation, just as vapor rises from water."

ANDREAS. [It was read in Greek.]

PROVINCIALIS. From this authority two things are singularly noteworthy. First, through the fact that the Spirit is granted from the Son, it is necessary to confess that He is from the substance of the Son — in the manner that was explained above. And he places one notable example, which is found in Scripture: for divine Scripture, wishing to show the eternal procession of divine wisdom and its eternity from the Father, uses the word "vapor," saying: *"For it is the vapor of the power of God and a certain emanation of brightness"* (Wis. 7:25) — using "vapor" to show eternity, and to show naturalness, because vapor rises from water whose nature it belongs to and proceeds from the water.

And therefore this great notable doctor makes this comparison: as the Son is the vapor of the power of God, so the Spirit is the vapor of the Son and proceeds from Him. Likewise, the same doctor in the same *Thesaurus*, wishing to show that the genitive "of the Son" implies the relationship of natural origin, says: *"Rightly does the Savior say of Himself in the Gospel: 'I am the truth' (John 14:6). But John, teaching that the Spirit is both from the substance of the Father and from the substance of the Son, says in the Gospel: 'the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father' (John 15:26); he gathers from the word 'who proceeds from the Father' that the Spirit is from the substance of the Father. And because he says 'the Spirit of truth,' he gathers that the Spirit is from the substance of the Son."*

ANDREAS. The authority was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. In the same *Thesaurus* he says that *"God is Spirit"* — the Apostle shows: *"the law of the Spirit of life"* (Rom. 8:2) — so that the Holy Spirit is found not only as the one laying down the law, but is already the Spirit of life existing; and what is this life if not Christ, who says: *"I am the truth and the life"* (John 14:6)? Therefore, with Christ laying down the law, His Spirit — as existing in Him and from Him naturally — lays down the law.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. This authority is very clear concerning that relationship, because from the fact that He is called the Spirit of life — just as when He is called the Spirit of truth — it necessarily concludes the relationship of natural origin. Therefore he immediately adds: *"His Spirit as in Him and from Him."* And now this is most true: that what is naturally from someone necessarily receives nature and being from him.

Likewise, in the same *Thesaurus*: *"Since therefore the Holy Spirit, by His coming, makes us conformed to God, and He has come forth from the Father and the Son, it is manifestly clear that He is of their substance, as naturally coming forth in it and from it."* See how manifestly he posits that the Spirit naturally comes forth from the Son, since by His coming He makes us conformed to God; and this coming forth must be understood substantially, as he himself here posits.

ANDREAS. He read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Now, that "coming forth" (*prodire*) is the same as "proceeding" (*procedere*), I prove from this: it is said in divine Scripture of the eternal Wisdom who proceeds from the Father: *"I came forth from the mouth of the Most High, the firstborn before all creation"* (Sir. 24:5). Jerome has translated it thus in our Bible. From the fact that the Son came forth from eternity, He receives being — and this can be understood in no other way than as proceeding. So Cyril posits that the Spirit proceeds from Father and Son. Therefore it is necessary that He receive substantial being, because he says: *"proceeding substantially from Him and in Him."*

Finally, Cyril says in these *Thesauri*: *"Since therefore, when renewing us to Christ, the Spirit is said to renew — according to that which is touched on in the Psalm: 'Send forth Your Spirit and they shall be created and You shall renew the face of the earth' (Ps. 103:30) — it is necessary to confess that He is from the substance of the Son, as naturally existing from Him and sent from Him to the creature, working the renewal as the complement of the Holy Trinity."*

ANDREAS. He read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. From this authority several things are very noteworthy. First: when he says that the Spirit is sent for the renewal of the creature, it is necessary to

confess that He is from the substance of the Son — as if he wished to say that He would not be sent for the renewal of the creature unless He proceeds from Him. And he declares this concerning the procession from the Son, because He is sent, he says, *"as naturally existing from Him and sent from Him to the creature."* And he adds: *"we must understand that He naturally exists from the Son in this temporal mission, because He is sent for renewal by the Son; and in this naturally existing from the Son"* — he says that He is *"the complement of the Holy Trinity."* Therefore it appears that He has His subsistence from the Son.

Responses to the Arguments of the Ephesian

Having completed the testimonies of the Latins and Greeks — omitting many arguments that could necessarily be adduced — drawing the conclusion of what the holy fathers have said, I will come to the response to the Lord of Ephesus. He said three things.

i. For first he seemed to draw doubt from this proposition — *"who proceeds from the Father"* — and said he had from blessed Gregory the Theologian, in the sermon on Pentecost, that this procession was —

[— *the text breaks off at this point* —]

Response to the First Objection: "Who Proceeds from the Father"

— *[continuing]* — and to proceed from the Father is considered the same. He himself, God, says: *"He will receive of mine"* — this which He receives, whether it be power, or virtue, or teaching, He says is to be received from the Son; and again He signifies it is to be received from the Father. This unity has no diversity; nor does it differ from whom it is received: what is given by the Father is seen also to be given by the Son.

To what was said about the property — I do not know where the Ephesian found it in the sermon of Gregory — because he always draws the inference that whenever he finds "He proceeds from the Father," he infers: therefore He does not proceed from the Son. How valid this inference is, any of the fathers can judge; indeed, no one — neither Greek nor Latin — has ever dared to say that He does not proceed from the Son, and yet the Ephesian always concluded: therefore not from the Son.

When blessed Gregory conveys knowledge of the properties, he says thus in the said Pentecost sermon: *"All that the Father is, these things are the Son's also, except for being unbegotten from the Father; all that the Son is, these things are the Spirit's also, except for being born from the Son."* Do you not see how well he orders these properties? If the Spirit had no order in relation to the Son — after having said *"all that the Father is, this the Son is"* — he would have immediately said: *"all that the Father is, this the Spirit is also,"* as receiving from the Father and not from the Son. But because he recoiled from this order, he placed the order in conformity with the other doctors, and in that same way compared the Spirit to the Son as the Son to the Father, without any ambiguity.

Now concerning the property, he never said that it was so proper to the Holy Spirit that He proceeded only from the Father. Indeed, it appears that what is proper to the Spirit is to proceed from Father and Son; and this is properly the property of the Holy Spirit — that He proceeds from Father and Son. But that property which is in the Father and Son with respect to the Spirit — which is called spiration or spirative power — that is not so properly the property of the Father alone that it does not also belong to the Son.

And if the Ephesian had studied theology well, he would have said this: there is a difference between personal properties and properties of a person, because personal properties are those by which the persons are constituted — but not so the properties of a person. Thus to be unbegotten is not the property by which the Father is constituted, nor is the spirative power — yet it is called a property in the broad sense. Now this is said in comparison to something else, just as we say that "rational" is proper to man in comparison to irrational animals, but not in comparison to angels, who are intellectual creatures. And this must be posited in divine things, because all doctors say that to be from another belongs to the Son and the Spirit of the Son, yet in no way belongs to the Father. Likewise we say that spirative power belongs to the Father and Son but not to the Holy Spirit — and it is a certain property.

Response to the Second Objection: "The Spirit is from God"

The Ephesian introduces as his second argument an authority where he adduces that the Spirit is called "from God" according to Paul — and that He is in no way

from the Son — when he says: *"We have received the Spirit, not that which is of the world, but that which is of God"* (1 Cor. 2:12). And to prove this he brought forward the authority of Dionysius and Athanasius, that the Father is the fountain of divinity.

If he had considered well the intention of the Apostle's authority, he would have found the answer. For the Apostle first says that He is the Spirit of God, and wishing to show this, says He is from God. Likewise all the doctors, from the fact that He is called Spirit of the Son, always conclude — according to the manner of the Apostle — that He is from the Son. It certainly does not follow that He is not from the Son, for the reasons already given.

Nor does what the Ephesian says follow from Athanasius and Gregory, in holding the Father to be the fountain of divinity. The Father is the first root, not from another, and is Father and principle; the principle does not produce the Spirit insofar as He is Father, but insofar as He has the spirative power — and this He communicates to the Son. And according to these doctors, the Son is thus the fountain of the Holy Spirit just as the Father is; nor are there two fountains but one, because the fountain according to which He is the fountain of the Holy Spirit is communicated to the Son. And Athanasius says this — that *"the Son is the fountain of the Spirit"* — but the Father is called the first root because the fact that the Son is the fountain of the Spirit is something the Son has from the Father.

Afterward the Ephesian enters upon the matter of the Council of Nicaea and says that there was a certain bishop there who responded to a certain philosopher that the Spirit proceeded from the Father and was proper to the Son. What follows from this? We grant that He proceeds from the Father and is proper to the Son; and all doctors conclude that He proceeds from the Son, because He is the Spirit of the Son. And if the Ephesian had produced the original book, a more extensive response would have been given. But we have the authority of the first Council of Nicaea and we do not have the original — just as you also, in your own authority, say thus: *"the Spirit of the Son and springing forth from Him."* Whatever may be the case in fact, I leave aside, because I have not seen the originals; indeed, we have it in Greek. Read in Greek the original words.

ANDREAS. He read from the Greek original.

Response to the Third Objection: Cyril's Letter Beginning "Let the Heavens Rejoice"

PROVINCIALIS. Second, the Ephesian adduces the authority of Cyril in the letter which begins *"Let the heavens rejoice,"* to show that the Spirit is not from the Son, when it says: *"We remember him who says: 'Do not transgress the boundaries'"* (Prov. 22:28) etc. Afterward it says *"that those fathers were speaking of the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father, and is not alien from the Son according to the principle of one essence"* — and from this the Ephesian wished to say that Cyril intended only that He is of one essence with the Son, and in no way from Him.

But I plainly showed above that wherever it says "He is not alien according to the principle of one essence," Cyril always immediately adds how the Son is the principle of the Holy Spirit. And this is evident, because he immediately subjoins two authorities of the Apostle Paul.

Afterward the Ephesian adduces the authority of Basil saying the Spirit is *"granted to the Son according to nature."* Concerning this "granting," I could not find it otherwise — because to say "it is granted" is the same as to say "it is given to the Son," because the Father, by naturally producing the Son, gave Him this: that the Holy Spirit should proceed from Him.

Afterward the Ephesian adduces the authority of Basil against Sabellius, where Basil says: *"the property of the Spirit's relationship to the Father, I understand, when He says: 'He proceeds from the Father' (John 15:26); the property of the Spirit's relationship to the Son, when I hear: 'If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His'"* (Rom. 8:9). This authority — about which there is such celebration — is the clearest foundation of our opinion. It is a matter of property, because the Son is second from the Father; Basil wished to understand the property of the Spirit in relation to the Son — according to which He originates from the Son — and founded himself on this, upon which all the holy doctors found themselves, because he says: *"Spirit of Christ."* So say all our doctors; thus this authority is on our side, and I give him thanks, because from his own mouth he has brought forth the truth of this matter.

Response to the Fourth Objection: The Second Council of Constantinople

Afterward the Ephesian introduces the **ii** Council of Constantinople, saying that there it was said that He *"proceeds from the Father"* and that holy Gregory the Theologian was there; and because they wished to understand the procession as from the Father and not from the Son, and he brings forward no proof — and with the same ease with which he said it, it is dismissed with equal ease, because the inference does not hold, as I have proved by many authorities.

Response to the Fifth Objection: The Third Council

Finally, he adduces the **iii** Council, and says that the fathers of this council, after having made the definition that no one else is permitted to alter it, also said at the end in similar manner: *"If any persons are found — whether bishops, clergy, or laity — believing or teaching the things written in the exposition which Charisius the presbyter brought forward concerning the incarnation of the Son of God, or similarly the perverse or wicked dogmas of Nestorius which are subscribed below — let them be subject to the sentence"* etc.

Now the Ephesian put forward a remarkable interpretation of this, saying that here mention is made only of those things written there in the creed concerning the incarnation of the Son of God, and that no mention is made of that particular clause in the altered creed which says that the Spirit is not the Son nor has essence from the Son — and that on this account those fathers condemned that clause. If he had read well that letter *"With our Savior,"* which I cited, he would have understood well how that clause was condemned.

Likewise, if he had understood from chapter **IX** of the **XII** — which is against that clause — where it says: *"If anyone says that Christ was glorified by the Spirit as by an alien power, and received from Him the ability to work against unclean spirits and to fulfill miracles in men — and does not rather call Him His own Spirit, through whom He worked — let him be anathema"* (Cyril, *Explicatio XII capitum, anathematismus IX*). This was said against that chapter which held that the Holy Spirit did not have essence from the Son — because it said He worked by an alien power. And this is placed in the **XIII** and **XVI** blasphemies, and for this reason such an opinion is most openly condemned.

And Cyril himself declares this in his *Apologia* against Theodoret and against the Easterners who attacked his chapters; and at the very Synod of Ephesus itself, where it was said he should declare how he understood the matter, he said briefly, expounding chapter **IX**: *"The only-begotten Son of God, made man, nonetheless remained God"* — because Nestorius denied this — and he adds: *"Being all that the Father is, except for being the Father alone, and having His own Holy Spirit innate to Him from Himself and substantially, He worked divine miracles and declared all the things of the Father to be in the Son, and that He has His own Spirit, who is innately from Him and substantially."* And he adds: *"But whoever says that He, as a man like one of us, used the working of the Spirit not as His own but as alien and not divine, and received as it were by way of grace the ascent into heaven through the Spirit, the power — let him be subject to the anathema."*

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

PROVINCIALIS. Now, because this Ephesian father alleged that holy Cyril had made a certain retraction — citing a letter of Theodoret — he concludes that we ought to believe Cyril's own letters more than Theodoret's. Theodoret himself also charged Cyril with having retracted the **XII** chapters in the letter he wrote to John of Antioch.

But as you have heard on other occasions, Cyril himself excuses himself; and so he writes to Acacius at the end of the letter: *"For if the letter written previously is brought forward as proof that we repented of the things we did at Ephesus, let this also be seen: for we are, by the grace of God, in sound mind and not beyond reason"* — as if to say: if I had retracted, I would have been beyond reason and sound mind. Likewise in the subsequent letter, where he also speaks to John of Antioch, complaining of certain persons who were introducing new expressions.

And at the **V** Synod, all that Theodoret wrote against Cyril was condemned; and so the pure truth of Cyril remained, as he himself had expounded it and as that holy ecumenical synod had approved.

Now the Ephesian put forward nothing more yesterday, and so I have nothing more to satisfy. From all this it has been sufficiently, openly, and manifestly shown — first from the testimonies of Scripture, then from the testimonies of so many Latin

and Greek fathers who lived at the same time and were illuminated by one and the same Spirit — and what is wonderful in this matter, that those very foundations which the Latin doctors had, those same foundations the Greek fathers took up to prove that the Spirit is from the Son as from the Father, and that they are one principle; and that in no way can the contrary be said without their being one principle, unless a distinction in nature between the Father and Son were posited, as the Arians said.

And since the Spirit has conceded as much as is humanly possible for people such as we are, and all the things about which the Ephesian had doubts have been most openly declared — nothing remains except what the Emperor Marcian said in the decrees he composed at the Council of Chalcedon, where, after the truth had been seen and declared through Pope Leo and received by the whole Council of Chalcedon, he said thus in one decree: *"It is the height of madness to seek a fictitious light in the bright and clear midday sun. Whoever, after truth has been found, delays any further, is seeking falsehood."*

It seems to us that these testimonies make the matter clear; and if we wished to illuminate the day with torches, it would be ridiculous. Likewise it seems that before so great a light and the citation of such clear doctors, to seek anything further would be nothing other than to seek falsehood. Whatever the case may be, having for my part fulfilled my office in this response, if anything remains doubtful for any of you and you wish it clarified, I offer myself and all my fathers as prepared to satisfy in the truth, by which we are bound.

ANDREAS. When these things had been set forth, the greatest silence was perceived when the speech was finished. For while the master was speaking, each one had been attentive to his words. Then, after these things had been set forth, the Metropolitan of Russia spoke thus.

Continuation of the Session of 24 March 1439

Metropolitan of Russia. Since the Reverend Father in these two assemblies said many and diverse things — both against the opposing fathers and the Easterners, and against the Greeks on behalf of the Latins, and moreover in a way that expanded at length; for your paternity spoke truly in these assemblies for eight

hours and more — from all of which, partly there were authorities of the saints that spoke in our favor, and partly those of your own Western Church in common: since our soul receives through the senses, especially those things that are said through hearing, and those things which are said at great length bring a satiety to the ears — because a surfeit of words is troublesome to the ears, since hearing impairs the sense's ability to transmit to the soul everything that is said at length — therefore we wish that what has been said by your paternity also be given to us in writing. Namely, that you give us those authorities cited from the books of the Latins, so that we may partly compare them with the authorities found among us, and partly that we may read in those books in order to understand better. Afterward we shall consider all these things diligently.

CARDINAL. He does not run alone in the stadium, as one who would wish to run without a disputant. Indeed, we would have wished that the Ephesian had been personally present, and we do not know for what reason he was absent. It would have been right that, just as the Provincial heard him, so he should have heard the Provincial in return. Although the Lord of Ephesus was not there, there were other companions present; and the Lord Provincial said he was prepared to give satisfaction, and the Lord Provincial asked the Emperor to bring the Ephesian.

As for the presentation of the writings: his scribes wrote and ours did too. When the Lord of Ephesus spoke, the Provincial did not delay the response on account of having copies to prepare. So likewise we ask that the response not be deferred, even if the scribes have not fully collected everything — for we do not wish to conceal anything, but to say it openly from the rooftops. We are content that our scribes and his meet at San Francesco, and we will bring the books and will have copies made from our books. We ask that they come, and we await you on Thursday.

ANDREAS. With this, the assembly of that day was dissolved.

Acts of Florence After the Public Sessions

ANDREAS. The Easter festivities intervened, and it seemed right that during that holy season there should be rest for study and celebration of the solemnities. In the octave of Easter, when the Latins pressed insistently that the Greeks respond to the

propositions that had been put forward, the Greeks in turn pressed that means of agreement be sought as an intermediary. Whether this was done out of a failure to provide responses, let him who has understanding consider. The Emperor began to meet almost daily with the Pope and various others, and many things were treated between them which, since they were not conducted publicly, I did not think fit to report otherwise. I hear from those who were present that many remedies were sought, so that the conclusion concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit might be composed without embarrassment to them, and so that they might not appear to have departed from the truth without some show of reason. Thus passed the whole of April and the month of May.

The Latin fathers, therefore, despairing of the hope of bringing the matter to a conclusion, the Supreme Pontiff — in order to take care for the honor of the Latins and to make known to all that the Greek cause had departed from the knowledge of truth — summoned separately from the Emperor the metropolitans and other Greek fathers on the first of June. With both the Latin and Greek fathers present, he addressed them in these words.

POPE. Venerable brothers and beloved sons. Having overcome so many distresses of mind and body, and labors by land and sea — for each one of you — and without counting the expenses incurred in the pursuit of truth: leaving our city of Bologna, I personally betook myself to the Council of Ferrara so that nothing might be lacking. And with the solemn disputations held there, compelled by necessity, we came in the middle of winter across the Alps to these parts of Tuscany, so that this holy work of union might receive its completion — sparing ourselves not at all on account of age, the inclemency of the season, or the dangers of the roads.

Having at last in this place heard the grave and pious disputations concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, we wonder that this matter does not reach a conclusion. A balance has been set up from the Sacred Scriptures, so that with just weighing — private affections set aside — we might search out the truth. And having heard the holy authorities, no responses are given by you, the Eastern fathers; nor do you profess the truth, which appears more clearly than the sun. I beseech you through the mercy of our God to embrace the truth; and if you cease to do so, to give reasons why you do not intend to do this. I call upon you in the

presence of these witnesses, and especially upon our notaries who have been called — offering to you that if you bring any responses, we shall hear them most graciously and give to them the clearest responses on our part.

ANDREAS. On that day there were present, specially summoned, a great many protonotaries; and such great reverence was brought to the minds of the attending Greeks by these words, that very many were observed to have come to tears from devotion. The Metropolitan of Russia responded on behalf of the Eastern fathers in this manner.

Metropolitan of Russia. Most blessed Father, we have heard what your Holiness has set forth. We will reflect upon these things and will take care that truth may have its place; and we will give a response to your Holiness.

ANDREAS. On the following day, word quietly spread that very many of the Greek fathers — who up to that point had expressed nothing — had gone to the Greek Emperor and to the Patriarch, declaring that since God had revealed the truth to them, they intended to follow it. And the Patriarch openly professed to them that he had most gladly wished for this very outcome.

For that venerable father was supremely intent upon this holy union. Day by day the opinions of the fathers came out publicly; and so, with the Emperor likewise asserting the same, by the consent of all the Easterners — with the exception of one Ephesian, whom we have described as disputant — the Latin fathers were summoned and they came together in agreement upon this document.

Agreement Between the Latins and Greeks Concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit

Since in this holy ecumenical council, by the grace of Almighty God, we Latins and Greeks have come together for the sake of the holy union to be undertaken among us, we have zealously taken care with one another that the article concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit be discussed with great diligence and continuous inquiry. Having brought forward testimonies from the divine Scriptures and very many authorities of the holy doctors both Eastern and Western — some saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, others saying

from the Father through the Son — all looking toward the same meaning under various expressions.

The Greek Position

We the Greeks have affirmed that when we say the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, we do not say this with the intention of excluding the Son. Rather, because we were of the opinion that the Latins were saying the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as from two principles and two spirations, we refrained from saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

The Latin Position

We the Latins assert that when we say the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, we do not say this with the intention of excluding the Father as though He were not the first and the principle of the whole divinity — that is, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit — nor that what the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son is something the Son does not have from the Father, nor that we assert two principles or two spirations. Rather we assert that there is only one principle and one single spiration of the Holy Spirit, as we have asserted up to this point.

The Joint Agreement

In the name, therefore, of the Holy Trinity — Father, Son, and Holy Spirit — we Latins and Greeks, in this holy and God-beloved union, with one mind, one soul, and one understanding, consent and agree, so that this truth of faith may be believed and received by all Christians. And thus we profess: *"that the Holy Spirit is eternally from the Father and the Son, and proceeds eternally from both as from one principle and a single spiration."*

We declare that what the holy doctors and fathers say — that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son — tends toward this meaning: that by this it is signified that the Son also is, according to the Greeks, the cause, and according to the Latins, the principle of the subsistence of the Holy Spirit, just as the Father is. And since all things that belong to the Father, the Father Himself

gave by begetting to His only-begotten Son — except for being the Father — this very thing, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, the Son Himself has eternally from the Father, by whom He was also eternally begotten.

The Death of Patriarch Joseph II, 10 June 1439

ANDREAS. The minds of all were immediately gladdened, proclaiming that what had been despaired of and seemed shipwrecked had arrived, by the miracle of God, at the saving harbor of truth. And truly, most beloved brother, this was not the work of man, but of truth itself.

That ancient father, venerable in appearance and weighed down by illness — the Patriarch of Constantinople — was longing for a session to take place. But there were several among our people who asserted that the question of the primacy, and the doctrines of consecration and purgatory, had first to be professed by the Eastern fathers before they could proceed to union with the Roman Church. And so, with this difficulty still standing, on the tenth of June, after sunset, the greatest anguish seized the Patriarch, and he passed away that very night.

But before his death he signed with his own hand the document put forward concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, and he departed this life humbly submitting himself to the rules of holy mother Church. So many and so great were the signs of total reconciliation seen that the Supreme Pontiff, with the sacred assembly of the Latins giving its approval, ordered that he be admitted to the communion of the Church.

With a great company of prelates, all the most reverend Cardinals standing present, and the Greeks chanting the funeral rites in their own manner wearing sacred vestments, he was laid to burial in the church of Santa Maria Novella, where the apostolic palace is. And upon his tomb these verses were inscribed:

I, JOSEPH, GREAT IN RELIGION, WHO WAS THE GREAT SHEPHERD OF THE EASTERN CHURCH, LIE HERE. THIS ONE THING I HAD DESIRED, INFLAMED BY A WONDROUS LOVE: THAT EUROPE MIGHT HAVE ONE WORSHIP AND ONE FAITH. I SOUGHT OUT ITALY; WE STRUCK ONE COVENANT, AND UNDER MY LEADERSHIP THE FAITH OF GREECE WAS

JOINED TO ROME. WITHOUT DELAY I TOOK TO MY BED; NOW FLORENCE KEEPS ME, THE CITY WHERE THIS HOLY COUNCIL HAS FLOURISHED. HAPPY, WHO WHILE LIVING WAS GRANTED SO GREAT A GIFT, WHO MIGHT DIE HAVING FULFILLED HIS OWN VOW.

This death prolonged the matter further, with the Latin fathers wishing all the doubtful points to be discussed. And in order that the Greeks might receive the doctrine of purgatory, the Latins recalled a certain document that had been presented to them at Ferrara, containing the norms of purgatory.

LUDOVICUS. What was the content of the document?

ANDREAS. It contained the sayings of the saints by which the existence of purgatory is proven. The content of the document was as follows.

Document of Agreement and the Sermon of Cardinal Julian Cesarini on Purgatory

Since you have requested that the faith of the Roman Church concerning purgatory be expressed, we respond briefly in these writings: *"that if those who have truly repented have departed this life in charity, before they have made satisfaction with worthy fruits of penance for what they have done and left undone, their souls are purified after death; and to relieve them of such punishments there avail them the suffrages of the faithful living — namely the sacrifices of Masses, prayers, almsgiving, and other works of piety. Those souls, however, who after receiving holy baptism have contracted no stain of sin whatsoever, and also those who, having contracted a stain of sin, have been purified — either while still in their bodies or after departing from them, as has been said above — are received immediately into heaven. The souls of those, however, who die in actual mortal sin or with original sin alone, descend immediately into hell, to be punished with unequal penalties. Nonetheless, on the day of judgment all men shall appear before the tribunal of Christ with their bodies, to render an account of their own deeds."*

When they said to us that this was not a dogma of the Eastern Church, and since they desired to hear by what authorities of Sacred Scripture and the holy fathers, and by what reason, this is founded — we, the deputies, in accordance with the teaching of blessed Peter *"ready to give an account to all who ask of the hope"* (1 Pet. 3:15) that is in us, have judged that we must satisfy your request — which appears to be principally about purgatory — with this response for now. If, however, you have asked for an account of the remaining things stated by us, we shall take care to satisfy you on those as well, with the Holy Spirit instructing us and with brotherly charity.

Proof from Sacred Scripture

That there is a place or purifying fire in the next world, as we have said, is declared:

First, from the Old Testament, in the book **ii** of Maccabees, chapter **XII**, where it says: *"It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins"* (2 Macc. 12:46). But it is not necessary to pray for those who are already in heavenly paradise, since they have no need; nor for those who are in hell, since they cannot be loosed or purified from sins. Therefore there are some who, after this earthly life, can be loosed or purified from sins.

This is declared also through what the Savior says in the New Testament, in chapter **XII** of Matthew: *"If anyone shall have spoken against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age nor in the age to come"* (Mt. 12:32). In which statement it is given to be understood that certain faults can be pardoned in this age and certain others in the age to come.

It is also declared through the Apostle Paul in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, where — treating of one who builds upon the foundation which is Christ, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble — he then adds, saying: *"the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire; and the fire shall test each one's work, what sort it is. If any man's work remain which he has built upon, he shall receive a reward; if any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire"* (1 Cor. 3:13–15). Since these words by their very nature declare themselves to be understood of the age and fire to come,

the phrase "he shall be saved, yet so as by fire" cannot fit the damned, because they shall not be saved but shall perish eternally; nor is it understood of those who die without sin, because concerning these he had just said: "if his work remains" — yet those who die without sin have nothing for which they would need to be purified by fire. It remains, therefore, that this should be understood of those others who are to be purified in another life, yet who will nonetheless be saved.

Proof from the Universal Custom of the Church

This is declared by the custom of the universal Church, both Latin and Greek, which prays for the dead and has always been accustomed to pray for them — which prayer is certainly useless if purgatory after death is not posited. For it would be pointless to pray for those who are already in heavenly glory or in hell.

Proof from the Authority of the Holy Roman Church

This is declared by the authority of the holy Roman Church, learned and instructed by the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul and by the other holy pontiffs who shone with innumerable miracles — whom both Greeks and Latins venerate as saints. This Church has always held this, always preached this, even in the time of union and continuously before the present disagreement arose.

Proof from the Fathers of the Church

The truth of our faith is declared by the authority of the holy fathers — both Greek and Latin — and especially those whom both Latins and Greeks received at the universal council, whose words are these: *"We follow in all things the holy fathers and doctors of the Church: Athanasius, Hilary, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Augustine, Theophilus, John, Basil, John of Constantinople, Cyril, Leo, Proclus; and we receive all that they have set forth concerning right faith and the condemnation of heretics."*

From some of these doctors and certain others we shall cite a few things for the sake of brevity.

First, blessed Augustine, in a homily on the fire of purgatory, expounding those words of the Apostle — *"no one can lay another foundation than that which has been laid, which is Christ Jesus"* (1 Cor. 3:11–12) — says: *"Many who misunderstand this reading deceive themselves with false security, thinking that even if they build mortal crimes upon the foundation of Christ, those sins can be purged by a transitory fire, and they can afterward attain to everlasting glory. This understanding, dearest brothers, must be corrected, because those who flatter themselves in such matters are deceiving themselves. For by that transitory fire, of which the Apostle says 'he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire,' not mortal but minor sins are purged."*

The same Augustine in book **XXI** of *The City of God*, chapter **XIV**: *"Some suffer temporal punishments in this life only, others after death, others both now and then — yet always before that most severe and final judgment. But not all come to the eternal punishments which are to follow after that judgment — those which will replace the temporal ones after death. For as we have said above, that which is not remitted to certain persons in this world is remitted in the world to come; that is, so that they be not punished with the eternal punishment of the world to come."* And in chapter **XX** he says: *"For it would not be truly said of some that it is not forgiven them either in this age or in the world to come, unless there were some to whom, though not in this age, it will nonetheless be forgiven in the world to come."*

The same Augustine in the book *On Burial*, to Paulinus: *"In the books of the Maccabees we read that sacrifice was offered for the dead; but even if it were nowhere at all read in the old Scriptures, the authority of the universal Church, which is evident in this custom, is of no small weight — for in the prayers of priests which are poured out to the Lord God at His altar, commemoration of the dead has its place."*

The same Augustine in the same book: *"Supplications for the spirits of the dead are not to be omitted — which the Church has taken upon herself to make for all who have died in the Christian and Catholic community, even without mentioning their names, under a general commemoration; so that those who lack parents, children, or any relatives or friends to make these supplications for them may have them furnished by the one pious mother in common. But if these supplications,*

made with right faith and piety for the dead, were lacking, I think they would profit little for those spirits, in whatever sacred places their bodies might be laid."

The same Augustine in the book *On Penance* says: *"For penance, if it comes at the last gasp of life, heals and liberates through the washing of baptism — so that those who are baptized at the end feel no purgatory; but enriched with the very goods of holy mother Church, they shall receive manifold good in true blessedness."* And further he says: *"Late penance is accustomed to deceive many. But since God is always powerful, He is always able to give life in death to those whom He pleases. Since, therefore, penance must be the fruitful work not of man but of faith, He can inspire it whenever His mercy wills, and reward from mercy those whom He could condemn from justice. But since there are many things that hinder and draw back the languishing one, it is most perilous and close to ruin to put off the remedy of penance until death. But even if one is converted, he shall live and shall not die; we do not allow, however, that he will truly escape all punishment. For first he must be purged in the fire of purgatory — he who has deferred to another life the fruit of conversion. This fire, however, though it is not eternal, is nonetheless in a wondrous manner grievous; for it surpasses any punishment that anyone has ever suffered in this life."*

The same Augustine in a certain sermon on the dead, which begins *"The hope of all Christians"*: *"And so,"* he says, *"by the prayers of the true Church, by the saving sacrifice, and by the almsgiving which are given on behalf of their spirits, there is no doubt that the dead are helped, so that the Lord deals with them more mercifully than their sins had deserved. For this, handed down from the fathers, the whole Church observes: that for those who have departed in the communion of the body and blood of Christ, prayer is offered when they are commemorated in their proper place at the sacrifice itself, and that through those making the offering it is recalled that the sacrifice is offered for them as well. And when works of mercy are celebrated for the purpose of commemorating them, who would doubt that they benefit those for whom prayers are not offered to God in vain? For it must not be doubted that these things benefit the dead — but such dead as lived before death in such a way that these things can be useful to them after death."*

Holy Ambrose also, expounding those words *"he himself shall be saved"* (1 Cor. 3:15): *"By this,"* he says, *"it is meant that he shall be saved, but shall suffer the*

pains of fire, so that purified through fire he may be saved; and whereas the faithless perish eternally, it profits him to have believed in Christ in part."

Blessed Gregory, the Supreme Pontiff, in the fourth book of his *Dialogues*, adduces many examples and revelations proving the existence of purgatory, and among other things says: *"Such as each one departs from this life, such he is presented at the judgment; but yet concerning certain faults a fire of purification before the judgment must be believed to exist, for the reason that Truth says: 'if anyone shall have spoken blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him either in this age or in the age to come' (Mk. 3:29; Mt. 12:32). In which statement it is given to understand that certain faults can be remitted in the age to come. For what is denied of one kind, by consequence of understanding it is evident that it is granted for certain others. But yet, as I have said before, this must be believed to be possible only for small and minor sins."*

The great and holy Basil also, in the prayers that are customarily said kneeling at the vigil of Pentecost — in one of them, the beginning of which is *"Hear us eternally flowing"* etc. — prays thus for the dead: *"Hear us as we pray and entreat, and grant rest to the souls of Your servants who have fallen asleep — our fathers, brothers, and the rest of our kindred and all who are joined to us in faith."* And in the following prayer, the beginning of which is *"Lord Almighty God and Father of mercies,"* he says: *"Hear us, Your humble supplicants who pray and entreat You, and grant rest to the souls of Your servants who have fallen asleep in a place of light, a place of green pasture, a place of refreshment, from which pain, sorrow, and sighing are far banished; and establish their spirits in the tabernacles of the just, in peace and remission."* And in the burial rites of the dead, he speaks thus on behalf of the deceased, addressing the Savior: *"I am the image of Your ineffable glory, though I bear the marks or punishments of the struggles of earth. Have mercy on Your creature, O Lord, and in Your mercy purify me; and granting me the longed-for homeland, make me a citizen of paradise, worthy through merits."*

Gregory of Nyssa, in the dialogue *On the Consolation and State of Souls After Death*, introducing as speaker the holy Macrina, sister of the great Basil, speaking after the death of Basil himself, says: *"God inflicts pain upon sinners — those who sinned by living wickedly — not from hatred or a desire for vengeance"* (Gregory of Nyssa, *De anima et resurrectione*); and further: *"And just as those who purify*

gold mixed with dross do not only melt away by fire what is adulterated, but the pure gold too is necessarily liquefied together with the admixture and remains — the pure remaining after the adulterated is consumed — so when vices are consumed by the use of purgatory, it is altogether necessary that the soul joined to them be in the fire until all the adulterated material and mixture implanted within it is removed and consumed by the fire."

Likewise Gregory, in the book which he wrote *On Those Who Sleep*, says: "*While, therefore, the power remains in nature to avoid evil, divine wisdom devised this counsel: to allow man in what he willed — so that, having tasted the evils he desired and having experienced those things he had chosen, he might of his own accord run eagerly back to his former blessedness, shaking off all that is vicious and irrational as a heavy burden — whether purified in the present life by the highest devotion and philosophy, or after his departure from this life by the rubbing of the purifying fire.*"

To this purgatory of which we now speak, blessed Dionysius also bears witness. In chapter **VII** of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, where he speaks of the prayer which the hierarch makes over one who has fallen asleep, he says: "*Then the divine hierarch proceeding makes the holy prayer over him who has slept*"; and further: "*In his prayer the hierarch beseeches the divine goodness to forgive him who has slept all that he sinned through human frailty, and to place him in the light and region of the living, in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, from where pain, sorrow, and sighing have fled away.*"

Let holy Epiphanius also be added, speaking against Aerius who blasphemed and said among other things that the prayers of the living profit the dead nothing. He says: "*And I know that we recite the names of the dead. What could be more fitting to do, what more opportune and wonderful than if we who are here believe that those who have died are living and that their substance has not perished, but that they exist and live with the Lord? Indeed, the most honorable preaching teaches and dictates that there is hope for those who pray for their brothers as though they were placed in a far country. The prayer offered for them is beneficial, although it does not cut off all faults. For often while we are in the world, we sin voluntarily and involuntarily, as the greater perfection may shine forth; for we also make a memorial of the righteous and pray for sinners — for sinners we implore the divine*

mercy." And further he says: "But let us return again to the consequence of the matter and say that the Church does this of necessity, having received it handed down from the fathers."

Damascene agrees with the above in a certain sermon *On the Suffrage of the Dead*, saying: *"The disciples of the Savior who knew the mysteries — the holy Apostles — ordained that in the awesome and life-giving mysteries there be made a memorial of those who have fallen asleep in faith"* — which blessed Thomas adduces in book IV of the *Sentences*, distinction XLV, in the first article on suffrage.

To this purgatory, Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, also bears witness, as blessed Thomas reports. He says: *"Just as,"* says the Apostle, *"he shall be saved, yet so as through the purging fire — whatever it shall find incautiously from the dust of the feet of earthly sense in past life — in which fire he remains so long as whatever of corpulence and earthly attachment clings to him is purged; for whom mother Church prays and devotedly offers peaceful gifts. And so, purified and thence going out pure, he stands before the Lord of Sabaoth, immaculate before His most pure eyes."*

Proof from Divine Justice

Seventh, the aforesaid truth is declared by the reason of divine justice, which leaves nothing done in a disordered manner unpunished — which is *"according to the measure of the offense,"* as Scripture says: *"it shall establish the manner of stripes"* (Deut. 25:2–3). Since therefore for every sin a man deserves a certain punishment, if he has not paid this in the present age, the order of justice requires that he satisfy it in the age to come; otherwise he would remain unpunished. But if one departs having shown contrition, he shall not pay this penalty in hell, according to that saying: *"The sinner in whatever hour he shall have groaned, he shall live and shall not die"* (Ezek. 33:12) — which must be understood of the life of hell. Nor shall he pay such a penalty in heaven, because it conflicts with the purity of the celestial home: *"nothing unclean shall enter"* (Rev. 21:27), nor according to Isaiah shall *"anyone who is defiled pass through"* (cf. Is. 35:8). For that home is one of rest, not of punishment; of joy, not of mourning. It remains therefore that, besides paradise and hell, some other place must be assigned in which this purification is undergone; and when this is accomplished — since he is

no longer unclean and defiled, and is made pure — he flies at once to see God and enjoy Him.

ANDREAS. These were the things set forth concerning purgatory. After these had been discussed among themselves by the Greeks over certain days, and other matters heard privately apart, the Greeks came to agreement with the Latin fathers upon this document:

"Likewise, if those who have truly repented have departed this life in charity, before they have made satisfaction with worthy fruits of penance for what they have done and left undone — that their souls are purged by purgatorial punishments after death; and that to relieve them of such punishments there avail them the suffrages of the faithful living — namely the sacrifices of Masses, prayers, almsgiving, and other works of piety that the faithful are accustomed to perform for other faithful according to the institutions of the Church. And that the souls of those who, after receiving holy baptism, have contracted no stain of sin whatsoever — and also those who, having contracted a stain of sin, have been purified either while still in their bodies or after departing from them, as has been said above — are received immediately into heaven and behold clearly God Himself, triune and one, as He is, though one more perfectly than another. But that the souls of those who depart in actual mortal sin or in original sin alone descend immediately into hell, to be punished with unequal penalties."

"For by her," says Wisdom —

Documents Concerning the Addition to the Creed, the Matter for Confecting the Most Holy Eucharist, and the Primacy

When these two documents had been concluded, since doubts remained concerning the primacy and the consecration of the most holy body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and since the question of whether it had been lawful to make an addition to the creed of the Roman Church had remained in suspense, the Latin fathers presented these documents to the Greeks.

Document i: On the Addition of "Filioque" to the Creed

The first was of this content: *"We define moreover that the explanation of the words 'and from the Son' — added to the creed for the sake of declaring the truth and by the necessity of the error then arising — was added lawfully and reasonably."*

Document ii: On the Matter for Confecting the Eucharist

The other was in this form: *"Likewise, that the body of the Lord is truly confected in both unleavened and leavened bread; and that priests ought to confect the body of the Lord in one or the other, according to the custom of their own Church, whether Latin or Eastern."*

Document iii: On the Primacy

The other had been in this form: *"Likewise, we define that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of blessed Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in the person of blessed Peter, full power was given by our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, rule, and govern the universal Church — as is also contained in the acts of the ecumenical councils and in the sacred canons. Renewing moreover also the order handed down by the canons concerning the other most holy patriarchs: that the Patriarch of Constantinople shall be second after the most holy Roman Pope; the third shall be the Alexandrian; the fourth the Antiochene; and the fifth the Hierosolymitan — with their privileges and rights safeguarded."*

Preparation for Further Discussion

When these had been presented, since the Greeks had not yet heard anything from our side concerning these last documents, they requested to hear something about them, and a day was appointed. On that day, with the Supreme Pontiff, the Greek Emperor, and the rest of the fathers of both the Western and Eastern Church

present, two men were appointed to set forth in a brief address the teachings of the Roman Church on these matters: namely the Provincial and the Lord de Torquemada, both brothers of the Order of Preachers.

ANDREAS. So that the desire of the Greek fathers might be satisfied from the contents of the two documents and that they might receive the teaching of the Roman Church, an assembly was held on the ... day of June, where, with the Pope, the Greek Emperor, and the Latins and Greeks present, the Pope began to speak thus.

POPE. Several cardinals and other prelates have gone to your majesty and have treated of the power of the Roman Pontiff and the confection of unleavened bread. And you said that you would willingly hear something about these matters. Hear from these masters what they will say, and afterward I will say something. Let those who have something to say come forward.

ANDREAS. The Provincial came forward, and the Lord Juan de Torquemada, and the Provincial began in this manner.

First Address of John of Montenegro on the Primacy

PROVINCIALIS. By the mandate and blessing of your Holiness, most blessed Father — since your Holiness commands that concerning the matter of the article on the primacy I say something about the terms and words set forth in our document, so that the truth may be plain to the Lord Emperor and the other fathers of the Eastern Church may clearly understand that all those words are well founded in the holy doctors approved by the Church — I shall pass through them briefly in order, following the sequence of those words.

i. The Roman Pontiff as Successor of Peter

Thus at the end of the document it was said: *"Likewise we define that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff are the successor of Peter."* This is the first condition attributed to the Roman Pontiff — that he is the successor of Peter — and that he succeeds him with the same authority and power. We show this as follows.

For in the VII ecumenical synod, as is recited in the third action of that synod, the most holy Pope Adrian, writing to Constantine and Irene and to the whole council in that decretal letter where he adduces several authorities for the veneration of images, says among other things concerning blessed Peter: *"For the prince of the Apostles himself, blessed Peter, who first presided over the Apostolic See, left perpetually to his successors who would succeed him in his most sacred see his primacy of apostolate and pastoral care; to whom also he handed down, by divine command, the power of authority — as it was granted to him by our Savior, by the Lord God — and his successors, by their tradition, venerate the sacred image of Christ and of His holy Mother and of the Apostles and of all the saints."*

From these words it is most evidently established that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter in the same power which Peter himself had from our Savior. And since many other authorities could be adduced concerning this — since this one is more than sufficient — I come to the next point.

ii. The Roman Pontiff as Vicar of Jesus Christ

There follows in the document: *"successor of Peter and Vicar of Jesus Christ."* This clause presents no difficulty in itself, because it is clear that he is called the vicar of another who receives another's authority over something in his stead. That Peter remained in the place of Christ on earth is evident from the Gospels. For Christ founded the Church upon Peter — which had been founded upon Himself — and conferred the keys upon him universally and generally, when He said: *"I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven"* (Mt. 16:19) — He excepted no one in the whole world. When He spoke to the Apostles, He did not speak so generally, because in that second manner all the Apostles are excepted with respect to others. In the first case, no one is excepted from the power of Peter; from which it follows that he himself can bind all and be bound by no one. Since, therefore, he holds the place of Christ on earth, it follows that he is His vicar; and since the Roman Pontiff succeeds in the same power — as has been proven — it follows that he is the Vicar of Christ. Therefore the holy Latin doctors say that Peter was made the prince of the Apostles so that the Church itself might have one principal vicar of Christ, to whom all its members might have recourse if perhaps they should

disagree among themselves. For if there were different heads, the bond of unity would be broken.

SERMO PRIOR IOHANNIS DE MONTENIGRO, DE PRIMATU

First Address of John of Montenegro on the Primacy

PROVINCIALIS. By the mandate and blessing of your Holiness, most blessed Father — since your Holiness commands that concerning the matter of the article on the primacy I say something about the terms and words set forth in our document, so that the truth may be plain to the Lord Emperor and the other fathers of the Eastern Church may clearly understand that all those words are well founded in the holy doctors approved by the Church — I shall pass through them briefly in order, following the sequence of those words.

i. The Roman Pontiff as Successor of Peter

Thus at the end of the document it was said: *"Likewise we define that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff are the successor of Peter."* This is the first condition attributed to the Roman Pontiff — that he is the successor of Peter — and that he succeeds him with the same authority and power. We show this as follows.

For in the **VII** ecumenical synod, as is recited in the third action of that synod, the most holy Pope Adrian, writing to Constantine and Irene and to the whole council in that decretal letter where he adduces several authorities for the veneration of images, says among other things concerning blessed Peter: *"For the prince of the Apostles himself, blessed Peter, who first presided over the Apostolic See, left perpetually to his successors who would succeed him in his most sacred see his primacy of apostolate and pastoral care; to whom also he handed down, by divine*

command, the power of authority — as it was granted to him by our Savior, by the Lord God — and his successors, by their tradition, venerate the sacred image of Christ and of His holy Mother and of the Apostles and of all the saints."

From these words it is most evidently established that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter in the same power which Peter himself had from our Savior. And since many other authorities could be adduced concerning this — since this one is more than sufficient — I come to the next point.

ii. The Roman Pontiff as Vicar of Jesus Christ

There follows in the document: *"successor of Peter and Vicar of Jesus Christ."* This clause presents no difficulty in itself, because it is clear that he is called the vicar of another who receives another's authority over something in his stead. That Peter remained in the place of Christ on earth is evident from the Gospels. For Christ founded the Church upon Peter — which had been founded upon Himself — and conferred the keys upon him universally and generally, when He said: *"I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven"* (Mt. 16:19) — He excepted no one in the whole world. When He spoke to the Apostles, He did not speak so generally, because in that second manner all the Apostles are excepted with respect to others. In the first case, no one is excepted from the power of Peter; from which it follows that he himself can bind all and be bound by no one. Since, therefore, he holds the place of Christ on earth, it follows that he is His vicar; and since the Roman Pontiff succeeds in the same power — as has been proven — it follows that he is the Vicar of Christ. Therefore the holy Latin doctors say that Peter was made the prince of the Apostles so that the Church itself might have one principal vicar of Christ, to whom all its members might have recourse if perhaps they should disagree among themselves. For if there were different heads, the bond of unity would be broken.

iii. The Roman Pontiff as Head of the Whole Church and Father of All Christians

There follows in our document: *"We define that he is the head of the whole Church and the father and teacher of all Christians."*

That he is the head is shown as follows. First, this is proved from the **VII** Synod itself, where it is said in the letter of Adrian to Tarasius that he *"stands as the head of all the churches."* It is proved from the fourth Council of Chalcedon. At the beginning of that synod, when Paschasius and Lucentius opened their mandate, they said: *"Leo the bishop is the head of all the churches."* Likewise in the encyclical letter which the whole Council of Chalcedon sent to Pope Leo — in which they sought confirmation of the things that had been done at the Council of Chalcedon — they say among other things of blessed Leo: *"You have kept for us the knowledge of the Lord, which the Lord Savior conferred for salvation, as a golden chain, being the interpreter of the voice of Peter to all, to whom as head over members you presided over those who hold your place, showing right counsel; the faithful princes presided for the adornment."* And likewise near the end of that same letter they say: *"We ask you to honor your own people, accepting our judgment; and as we have given our good consent to the head, let the head fulfill toward the children what is fitting."*

There are many other authorities and numerous testimonies of the saints by which this same point can be proved; but for the sake of brevity, since this proof is conclusive, I pass on to the others. From which authority, moreover, it is manifestly established that the universal Church, however it may be considered — whether assembled or not — stands in the relationship of members with respect to the Roman Pontiff, and the Roman Pontiff is always set before them as head over members.

That he is the father of all Christians is evident from the Council of Chalcedon. For near the end of the fifth session, when the conclusion had to be given to the definition, and when the most magnificent judges were pressing on behalf of the Emperor Marcian that the addition be made according to the judgment of Pope Leo, all the bishops of the synod cried out that they accepted what the judges had said, and that *"what our father Leo's determination holds, this we hold and believe;*

what the confession of Leo, the father of all, holds." And so it is grasped that if he was the father of all those present at Chalcedon, he is the father of all, because all Christians were represented there.

ANDREAS. The Cardinal of Sant'Angelo interposed, saying that Chrysostom in his homily on John, chapter **XXIX**, on the words *"follow me,"* says: *"But if anyone should ask how James alone received Jerusalem, I shall say that Peter was ordained teacher of the whole world."* And in the synodal letter of Agatho, recited at the **VI** Council, it is said that by God's command the Pope has the duty *"to instruct and teach the Christian people."* And in the same authority of John Chrysostom it follows: *"because the Lord foretold great things and committed the world to Peter and foretold his martyrdom."*

iv. The Roman Pontiff as Teacher of the Whole Christian Faith

PROVINCIALIS. That he is the teacher of the whole Christian faith is shown from the synodal letter of most blessed Athanasius, which he wrote to most blessed Pope Felix, where he says among other things: *"You, as destroyer of profane heresies and of all attackers, stand as the prince and teacher and head of all orthodox doctrine and immaculate faith."* Since all Christians share and ought to share in the faith, and he is placed as teacher of the whole immaculate faith by reason of the privilege granted to Peter — it follows that he is the teacher of all Christians.

v. The Primacy Over the Whole World

There follows in the document: *"and in blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles."*

CARDINAL. You omitted: *"and to hold the primacy over the whole world."*

PROVINCIALIS. That is true, and this is shown as follows. For in the second letter of Adrian to Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople — as is evident from the third action of the **VII** Synod — among other things it is said: *"The see of blessed Peter, holding the primacy over the whole world, shines forth and stands as the head of all the churches of Christ."*

Likewise, holy Pope Anacletus — ordained a presbyter by holy Peter — in his third decretal letter, which he wrote to all the bishops, says among other things: *"The sacrosanct Roman Church has obtained the primacy not from the Apostles but from the Lord our Savior Himself, just as He said to Peter: 'You are Peter and upon this rock' etc. (Mt. 16:18). From which it is clear that the see of Peter and the Roman Church is said to hold the primacy by reason of Peter, because by the words 'You are Peter' etc., all power is derived in the Apostolic See through the succession of those who sit in it."**

This same thing holy Pope Julius, writing to all the Eastern bishops, says among other things: *"It was established long ago by the holy Apostles and their successors in the ancient decrees, and the holy Apostolic Church holds"* — and he speaks of the Nicene Synod, he himself being the second after Pope Sylvester — *"that councils should not be celebrated without the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, nor should bishops be condemned, because they wished the holy Roman Church to have the primacy over all the churches"* — as the Lord says — *"whence it is set before all the churches."*

There are many other authorities, but for the sake of brevity let these suffice.

vi. The Power of Feeding, Ruling, and Governing the Universal Church

There follows in the document: *"and that to the same see and Roman Pontiff, in blessed Peter the prince of the Apostles, was given the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal Church."*

Since the first point is that of feeding, this is proved so clearly from the words of the Gospel that it needs no further proof. For since the act of feeding is the act of a shepherd, and since it was said *"Feed, feed my sheep"* (John 21:17) — he was made absolutely the shepherd of all the sheep, making no distinction between these sheep and others, since the meaning is: all those entrusted to him. Since, therefore, even the Apostles are sheep of Christ, there is no one who, bearing the name of Christian, can say that he is not placed under the governance of the Roman Pontiff.

To follow the form, I wish to prove this by two testimonies. Thus most blessed Adrian, in the letter to Tarasius, says among other things: *"Hence the same blessed Peter, feeding the Church by the voice of the Lord, left nothing unresolved, but always held and holds the primacy."* Since he says "he left nothing unresolved," it follows that he wished to include all under his care.

Likewise, in the VI Synod, from the letter of Pope Agatho which he sent to Constantinople — in which he wrote the tome of faith against the error of those who said there was one will and one operation in Christ — a letter received with outstretched hands by the whole synod with great veneration, containing many sayings of the saints — among other things it says: *"Striving with the help of blessed Peter the Apostle, who received by the eternal disposition of the Redeemer of all the task of feeding the spiritual sheep of the Church, and the Apostolic Church has never deviated to any part of error; whose authority and sanction, as of the prince of all the Apostles, the universal Catholic Church of Christ and all the universal synods have ever embraced, and all the venerable fathers have embraced his apostolic teaching";* and a little further: *"This is the Apostolic Church of Christ, the spiritual mother of your empire, which by the grace of Almighty God has never succumbed by erring from the path of apostolic truth, but as it received from the beginning of the Christian faith from the princes of the Apostles of Christ, it has remained inviolate in the faith unto this day, according to the assurance of the Savior Himself, which He declared in the sacred Gospels to the prince of His Apostles, saying to Peter: 'Peter, behold Satan has desired to sift you' etc. (Lk. 22:31–32) 'I have prayed for you, that your faith may not fail; and you, when you are converted, confirm your brothers.' Let your clemency consider that the Lord Himself — whose faith it is, who promised that the faith of Peter would not fail — said to confirm the brothers; which it is known to all that the apostolic pontiffs, predecessors of my unworthiness, have always done with confidence."*

From this proof he asserts three things manifestly: first, that the pasturing of all the flocks is committed to Peter and his successors. Second, that the Apostolic See has never been cast down into any part of error, but has always remained immaculate in the faith. Third, that its authority is so great that the universal Church and all the universal synods have always faithfully followed it, and the Catholic fathers have always received its apostolic teaching; and that those words *"that your faith may*

not fail" (Lk. 22:32) are understood of the Apostolic See, and because it is immune from heresy for the confirmation of all brothers wavering in the faith, this belongs to that see and to the Roman Pontiff.

There follows the clause: *"of feeding and convening."* That this act belongs to the Roman Pontiff is proved thus from that encyclical letter which the fathers of Chalcedon wrote to Pope Leo, where, speaking of Dioscorus and the evils done by him, they say: *"Above all these things he also devised the fury of excommunication against him who had undertaken the care of the vineyard — we speak of your Holiness — who hastened to unite the body of the Church — we speak of your Holiness."* If, therefore, Leo, who was the successor of Peter, had the task of uniting the body of the Church, then the word "convening" is fittingly placed. There follows the word *"ruling."* This clause is sufficiently established from what has been said, because if he is the prince, if he is the head, if he is the rector — then he has the task of ruling. For it belongs to the shepherd to rule the sheep; and for the sake of brevity I adduce one testimony of Pope Anacletus in the letter I cited above, where he says: *"The Apostolic See, the head of the Church"* — as has been said before — *"was instituted by the Lord and not by another; and as a door is governed by a hinge, so by the authority of this holy Apostolic See all the churches are governed, by the disposition of the Lord."* And Pope Leo in the sermon of his consecration says this concerning the governance: *"From the whole world one Peter is chosen, who is to be set before the calling of all nations and all the churches and all the fathers of the Church; so that, although in the Church of Christ there are many priests and many shepherds, Peter may rule all those whom Christ principally rules. The divine dignity, most beloved, granted to this man a great and wonderful partnership in His power, and if He wished anything to be common to the other princes along with him, He never gave it except through him, whatever He denied to others."*

There follows: *"and governing."* That this belongs to the Roman Pontiff I prove by the testimony of Leo in the same sermon, where he says: *"The solidity of that faith which is praised in the prince of the Apostles is perpetual; and as what Peter believed in Christ endures, so what Christ instituted in Peter endures";* and a little further: *"the arrangement of truth endures, and blessed Peter, in the received..."*

And so, the helm of governance having been received through Peter and passed to his successor the Roman Pontiff, the act of governance most truly belongs to him.

vii. The Plenitude of Power

There follows: *"the full power of feeding and governing entrusted."* That this is so appears from the word of the Savior in chapter **XVI** of Matthew — universally and indiscriminately with respect to all cases — when He said: *"I will give the keys and whatever you shall bind"* (Mt. 16:19). That it is also full with respect to all territories and all persons appears from that *"feed my sheep"* (John 21:17), from which no person is excepted; and I adduce one testimony. For most blessed Leo in the cited sermon continues thus: *"For so Peter was appointed above the rest, that being called the rock, being proclaimed the foundation, being made the doorkeeper of the kingdom of heaven, being appointed the arbiter of binding and loosing — even persevering in the enduring strength of what he had received — he did not leave the helm of governance of the Church."*

"— set over the definitions of his judgments in heaven — we might know, through the very names of his appellations, what manner of fellowship with Christ he had; who now more fully and powerfully carries out all things entrusted to him and fulfills all parts of his offices and charges in Him through whom he was glorified. If, therefore, anything is rightly done and rightly ordered by us, it is the work and merit of him whose authority excels and whose power sits in his see."

If, therefore, the power sits in the Apostolic See, it is evident that it is above all the churches. And let these suffice for the declaration of the words.

CARDINAL. When the letters of Adrian were read, the legates of the Apostolic See at the synod said: *"Let the synod say whether it receives the letters of the senior father, the Roman Pontiff."* They responded: *"We follow and receive the letters."* Then **CCCXXX** bishops by name, who were at the synod, approved the said letters of Pope Adrian — letters which were not only Adrian's alone but synodal letters of the East, since in them is the definition of the universal council. And likewise concerning the letters of Agatho, which were approved at the **VI** Synod.

POPE. Speak on.

First Address of John of Torquemada on the Matter and Form of the Most Holy Eucharist

ANDREAS. The Lord of Torquemada began, who had been appointed second to speak, in this manner.

LORD OF TORQUEMADA. By the command and ordinance of your Holiness, most blessed Father — I will say a few things, with the blessing of your Holiness, about to speak on two clauses which concern the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist. I shall deal with them very briefly, because everything I am about to say seems to me so entirely clear to all Catholic Christians that it would not be fitting to be abundant in speech.

Part i: The Matter of the Eucharist — Unleavened and Leavened Bread

The first clause is that the sacrament is confected in unleavened bread and in leavened bread. In the Eucharist two things are to be considered: first the matter, second the form of consecration. And concerning these two things there are two clauses placed in the present document. The first clause concerns the matter, when it says: *in unleavened or in leavened bread*. In this clause two things are to be considered: first, what is necessary; second, what is fitting or reasonable.

What is necessary in the matter of this sacrament is that the bread be made of wheat. But whether it is unleavened or leavened is not of the necessity of the sacrament — it can be consecrated in either — and this is what the document says: *in unleavened or in leavened*. Therefore blessed Gregory speaks in the register that the Roman Church offers unleavened bread, because it received the most pure body from the Virgin. But certain other churches offer leavened bread, because the Word clothed in flesh is united to the flour as leaven.

Concerning the first point, it is to be observed that it is not of the necessity of the sacrament whether it be unleavened or leavened. The second thing to be considered is fittingness or reasonableness; and according to this we say that the sacrament is confected with greater fittingness and reasonableness in unleavened bread than in leavened, and therefore the holy Roman Church has held and observes this custom.

This fittingness is gathered from three things:

First, from the institution and practice of Christ — for Christ is read to have confected in unleavened bread, which I shall show from **IV** authorities. These **IV** are **IV** authorities from the holy Gospel.

The first is from Matthew, chapter **XXVI**, where it says: "*On the first day of unleavened bread, the disciples came to Jesus saying: Where will you that we prepare for you the Passover?*" (Mt. 26:17). But it is the case that on the day of unleavened bread there was no leaven in the houses of the Hebrews. So the law has it in Exodus, chapter **XII**, where it is written that on the day of unleavened bread there shall be no leaven in your houses (Ex. 12:15).

The second authority is from Mark the Evangelist, chapter **XIV**, where it says: "*Now on the first day of unleavened bread, when the Jews sacrificed the Passover, the disciples say to Jesus: Where will you that we go and prepare that you may eat?*" (Mk. 14:12). From this the same inference is drawn as from the first.

The third authority is from Luke, chapter **XXII**, where he speaks similarly: "*And the day of unleavened bread came, on which it was necessary that the Passover be killed. And he sent two — namely Peter and John — saying: Go and prepare, that we may eat the Passover*" (Lk. 22:7). But you will say: on which it was necessary that the Passover be killed — that was the fourteenth day of the moon, on which the lamb was to be eaten with unleavened bread. Therefore it manifestly follows that Christ at His supper used unleavened bread, and confected in the same bread which He ate. It therefore follows that He confected this most holy sacrament in unleavened bread.

The fourth authority is from Matthew, chapter **V**: "*I came not to abolish the law but to fulfil it*" (Mt. 5:17). But the most singular law of the old law was that the Paschal lamb should be eaten with unleavened bread, as clearly appears in chapter

XII of the book of Exodus. It therefore follows that Christ, who fulfilled the law even unto death, confected in unleavened bread.

Nor should it be said or believed by any faithful person that blessed Evangelist John is contrary to the three Evangelists. Far be this from every Christian heart — that anything false be placed in Sacred Scripture, as blessed Augustine argues in a certain letter to Jerome: *"if in any place of Sacred Scripture something false is found."* Likewise it would be most unfitting to say that the disciples of Christ — to whom He said: *"It is not you who speak"* (Mk. 13:11) — are found to have said contrary things concerning the matter of the Savior.

It must therefore be said that the Evangelists speak in the same sense and meaning, and if there appears to be any difference, it is to be referred only to some difference in expression — though in fact there is none; the force of the speech is to be taken from the understanding of the speaker. For the concord of the witnesses it must be known, therefore, that the feast day of which blessed John speaks was the fifteenth day of the moon. And it is to be noted that it was the custom of the old law that in celebrations the feast days were counted from evening to evening. The evening of the fourteenth day of the moon, on which Christ ate the lamb and confected the sacrament, was counted together with the feast day. When John says *"before the feast day"* (John 13:1), his meaning is to be understood in harmony with the others in this way: blessed John called the evening in which the supper took place *"before the feast day"* by reason of the distinction of natural days. The others call that same evening the first day of unleavened bread by reason of the Jewish solemnity's rite, which reckons the feast day from the evening — and thus it is clear that there is no diversity and no contradiction among these doctors of the Church and instruments of the Holy Spirit. These things seem to me sufficient, unless someone should bring forward something contrary, to which I am prepared to respond. As I said before, I am content with few words.

Part ii: The Form of Consecration

I come next to the clause which touches on the form of consecration, where the document says: *"that the words of the Savior spoken in the confectio"* etc. I shall say a few things, because I believe there is no wise man who should not receive

these words with full faith and perfect belief. I shall touch on the authorities to prove that the body of Christ is confectioned by the words of the Savior alone.

The first authority is from most blessed Chrysostom, from his **IV** homily on the divine... After many words he says: *"It is not a man who makes the gifts set forth become the body — but He who was crucified for us, Christ. The priest standing and uttering the words is but the figure; but the power and the grace is Christ's. 'This is my body,' He says (Mt. 26:26); this word transforms the gifts set forth; and just as that voice which says: 'Increase and multiply and fill the earth' (Gen. 1:28) was spoken once and yet through all time strengthens our nature to the procreation of children — so also the voice..."*

The second authority is from Damascene, a Greek man of wisdom, who says in book **IV** of the *Sentences* that by the sole operation of the Holy Spirit the body of Christ is made from bread. If, therefore, by the sole operation of the Holy Spirit the sacramental forms are operative, then the word of God alone can accomplish this.

Likewise, what Dionysius the Greek places at the end of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* seems to bear on this: he says that in the consummative forms of the sacraments the operative powers are from God.

Fourth, the authority of most blessed Ambrose — most renowned in both churches — who says in the book *On the Sacraments*: *"The bread on the altar was ordinary bread before the words of the sacraments. When it comes to the sacrament, it becomes the flesh of Christ from bread"* (Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, **IV**:4). And further he asks by whose words and speech the consecration takes place. He answers: by those of our Lord Jesus Christ. *"For as to the rest of what is said here" — namely in the Mass — "praise is offered to God, prayer is made for the people, for kings, for others; but when the sacrament is confectioned, the priest does not use his own words but the words of Jesus Christ. Therefore the word of Christ accomplishes the sacrament."* These are the words of Ambrose.

Likewise, most blessed Augustine in the *Book on the Trinity*: *"Not every bread, but that which receives the blessing of Christ, is made the body of Christ."*

Arguments from Reason

Now I come to certain arguments which appear to give support to the fittingness of our document.

The sacrament is confectioned by the words of Him by whose power the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ. This proposition is made clear by the words of most blessed Dionysius, who — as I touched upon above — says that in the words of the sacraments there are operative powers. But it is impossible that transubstantiation from bread into the body of Christ should occur by the power of any creature; therefore it is impossible that transubstantiation should take place by any words other than those of the Savior.

ii. I argue thus. Christ instituted this sacrament either perfect or imperfect; but perfection lies in the form or the matter. But it must not be said that He made it imperfect — Deuteronomy, chapter **XVII**: "*the works of Christ are perfect*" (cf. Deut. 32:4). Therefore Christ, in bringing about the confection, gave a perfect matter and a perfect form.

Furthermore, the form of words perfects the sacrament — just as we say in natural things that form perfects matter, so the sacramental form falling upon the proper matter perfects the sacrament. Hence blessed Augustine says that "*the form of words comes to the element and the sacrament is perfected.*" But the words of no saint can accomplish this — only those of Christ. Therefore it necessarily follows that the sacrament is perfected in the words of the Savior alone.

iii. I argue thus. What form did Christ and the Apostles use in this sacrament? It is clear that they used not the words of Basil but their own words. And He left this determination and example; therefore we ought to use the words of the Savior alone.

iv. I argue thus: **v.** The unity of the Church is necessarily founded in the unity of faith and the unity of the sacraments in those things which belong to the substance of the sacrament. The Church — nor the whole world — could change this unless the Lord commanded it. Therefore it is necessary that all the faithful agree in this sacrament, which is — as Dionysius says — the consummating sacrament of all sacraments. Therefore it is necessarily the case that the same substantial words are common to all; because if someone adds to the words of Christ something as

belonging to the substance of consecration, he thereby changes the species of the Church's form — just as a unit added to a number changes the species of the number. So any addition, if it is said to belong to the substance of the form, is a change of the form, and thus there will not be unity in the sacrament.

I say notably "*of the substance*," because variety in certain words which are not believed to be of the substance — even if they were not said — would not be considered to split the unity of the sacraments. So it is with the form of baptism between you and us: whatever belongs to the substance of baptism, both you and we have it. Likewise it is necessary that in our document — if teaching is to be given to all the faithful, and especially to simple folk who might doubt whether other words of the saints that are added are words belonging to the substance of consecration or not — it be stated that the consecration consists in the words of the Savior alone. Nor should anyone be moved by someone saying that a given missal was written by the hand of a great saint. It is one thing to say: this missal belongs to a certain saint; it is quite another to say that the saint declared that the body of Christ is confectioned by all the contents of that missal. It should not be believed that blessed James or any other doctor said that the body is confectioned by words other than those of Christ — however many prayers and supplications there may be in the missal, asking that the Lord may deign to pour forth. Let this suffice for now.

ANDREAS. When these things had been said, the Pope used these words.

POPE. These men have heard what has been said in the presence of your fatherhoods, and it was said to please you and to accommodate you — not because we believe that you all do not hold these things as we do, especially concerning the consecration of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is accomplished by the words of Christ; nor should it be believed that any doctor could give a form from his own words for the confection of the body of Christ. Those who are truly most holy — as you are — believed no differently than others; all held that it is confectioned by the words of the Lord alone. Nor is it placed in that document because we believe they do not believe this — but for the sake of simple folk.

Concerning the matter of unleavened bread, you have heard what was said. We do not deny that one can also confection in leavened bread; and although many Easterners confection in leavened bread and some in unleavened, the Roman Church

holds to unleavened. Nor do we doubt that our Lord Jesus Christ — just as He brought us to agreement on the matter of the procession — will also bring us to agreement in this matter of confection. But we are well content; and for the completion of this work it seems necessary that a definition be made concerning those **IV** articles: namely, on the procession of the Spirit, on unleavened and leavened bread, on the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and on the matter of purgatory.

And since the matter of the addition has been introduced — although it would have sufficed to discuss only the truth — and since the matter was long debated at Ferrara, whether those words "*and from the Son*" were added and whether it was lawful to add them: in all the disputations you introduced the excommunication of the Roman Church on account of the addition. And although many clear responses were given — and finally by the Cardinal of Santa Sabina — it was seen that those words were added by way of declaration; and it therefore seems just, for the perfection of the holy union, that a definition be made that it was done lawfully. By this the honor of the Roman Church is preserved and your honor is preserved as well. Therefore we ask your charities to be pleased to accept this document, made with all charity, because in these matters nothing should be attended to except the honor of Christ. It will cause the grace, concord, and salvation of all Christian souls; and we hope through these things that our Lord Jesus Christ will give the will to Christians to relieve those Christians who have long been oppressed by unbelievers. From this document a session will be held, and then, with God's grace, we can dispatch His Excellency. And we have given the document to the Metropolitan of Russia, the Nicene, and the Mitylenean, who have kept it. If it has been published to all, that is pleasing; if not, we shall have it published to all. And having seen it, we hope that they will be most content, and you will be of the same opinion as we are; and we intend to preserve your honor in all things as our own.

ANDREAS. The Emperor nodded to the prelates and nobles to come to him, and they spoke with one another for a long time. Then the Emperor spoke.

EMPEROR. Most blessed Father. We have heard what was said by those fathers, who said things at excessive length — things which it does not seem necessary to respond to either now or in the future.

POPE. Nor was it said in order that a response should be given.

EMPEROR. Because if we wished to respond point by point, we would need as much time as in the past — and time does not permit me to remain here, since I have decided to depart with these galleys, because the time of my absence seems quite sufficient — especially since I believe that God has granted me the grace to have accomplished that for which I came. Therefore, holy Father, when the reverend Lord Cardinal came to me along with certain others, I responded quite fittingly. Nonetheless, concerning what your Holiness has requested, I shall be able to consult with my people, although it does not seem possible to deliberate otherwise than as I have said. These things seem sufficient to say for now; we shall consider further with our people. As for the document being handed over to me — it does not seem necessary to me to be given another document, since I am well informed of it; concerning the contents of that document we have spoken with the Cardinals and received information from our metropolitans.

POPE. Those things were said not in order to have a response, and it is pleasing to me that there be no response. That you hasten your departure with the galleys, this also pleases me — the matter of the union of the Church having been dispatched. And he says rightly that he has tarried very long — indeed, too long. And you know, and all know, that you wished it so. Before the departure of the galleys there is a month and a half; and it has been thirteen months since they could have dispatched themselves as now. And we desire that he return with peace and glory. It is pleasing that he consider the document with his people; and if they wish to say anything, a response shall be given. And I have compassion for him and for the other elderly men.

EMPEROR. I see that certain things have been changed from what was said before by the most reverend Lord Cardinals, and I wonder that you believe we wish to receive that document without discussion. And since your Holiness has said that the deadline until the departure of the galleys is a month and a half — if it seemed that some provision might be made in the meantime, that would be good; but if no provision is made, it seems altogether that other provision must be made.

POPE. Even without the union being made, I sent that nobleman of my household who came with him to secure the galleys; and he told the metropolitans — hoping

that all things would be ready — that they could return with glory and honor. You can apply yourselves to the document; after that nothing shall be lacking.

EMPEROR. The time is far too brief, since the provision made by your Holiness does not seem sufficient, because perhaps that nobleman did not go fully equipped. However, let this suffice.

ANDREAS. On the twentieth day of June, an assembly was held in the manner of the preceding one, where all being assembled except the Emperor, the Lord Cardinal began.

CARDINAL. Our most holy Lord has said that I should set forth the reason for this assembly. Yesterday, my reverend lords, the Lord of Fermo and the Lord of Venice and other fathers went to the Lord Emperor; and among other things, his Serenity — both on his own behalf and through the word of the Lord of Nicaea — wished to be informed about certain matters touching on the power of the Roman Pontiff. Since the hour was late and it was necessary to have the counsel of our most holy Lord and of others, we therefore responded that the matter needed to be referred to the Pope. Our most holy Lord, having taken counsel with the Cardinals and the council, deliberated that this morning the Emperor and the others should hear.

And therefore the Provincial began to speak.

Second Address of John of Montenegro on the Primacy

PROVINCIALIS. Our Lord would have very much wished the Emperor to be present. Since he is not, we ask that you hear patiently and report what you have heard to him, because truly all things are said with great charity and for the best end.

PROVINCIALIS. By the mandate and blessing of our most holy Lord — since, as the reverend Lord Cardinal has said, while those reverend Lord Cardinals and the other deputies were in the presence of the Lord Emperor, his Serenity requested a declaration concerning the terms set forth in the matter of the primacy of the

Apostolic See — and so that the declaration might be more ample, he commissioned the Lord of Nicaea to raise certain objections in opposition, to which we might respond. And since this matter has been introduced in the manner of a disputation, I shall respond according to the propositions of his paternity. From this the declaration of what the Emperor was requesting will appear here; and if after my words his paternity wishes to make any replication, our Church and I shall always be prepared to give further clarification.

Preliminary Foundation: The Authority of Decretal Letters

But before I begin the response to the first objection, it is necessary to establish between your paternity and me one firm foundation, from which the solution to one of his questions will become clear. And since this must be placed first and foremost, I set it forth first.

Yesterday, in declaring the clauses set forth in that chapter, I adduced testimonies from certain letters that were sent by the Apostolic See and received with great veneration by those ecumenical councils. Among these, three letters were adduced in particular: the letter of the Chalcedonian Synod to Pope Leo, the letter of Pope Adrian directed to those emperors — which was recited in the council — and another letter of most blessed Pope Agatho. And concerning these letters it was said that what we were adducing from them seemed to be words placed in the manner of honor, and they seemed not to carry the authority the speakers would have wished; they wished rather to see canons or chapters of councils from which those things placed in the chapter on the primacy could be gathered.

To this objection I respond as follows: those decretal letters, since they were all synodal letters, have no less authority than the canons themselves — indeed they appear to have greater authority. For your paternity well knows that in all those ecumenical synods in which definitions of faith were made, before the definitions were promulgated, it was necessary to bring forward the testimonies and letters of the saints, from which the fathers of the councils promulgated their definitions and canons, so that the reasoning of the definitions was drawn from the force of the testimonies. And you know that in the **iii** Synod, for the solidity of the definition, it is placed in the letters of Cyril and those **XII** chapters; among the other saints adduced there, the letter of blessed Pope Julius sent to the Easterners is adduced,

and the letter of Pope Felix. And if they had not had the authority of canons, they would not have been adduced; and since they were synodal letters, they were of greater authority than the canons made in the synods, because the Holy Spirit works in the Roman Church as in other councils.

The letter of Pope Agatho was of great authority, and it was necessary that he himself declare the authority of the Apostolic See so as to give authority to the confirmation of the faith which he had made. Indeed it was of such authority that the **VI** ecumenical synod did not dare to add to the definition made in the Roman synod — and this appears from the letter which you cited many times at Ferrara, where, granting authority to his legates, he says: *"We have given license and authority before your most tranquil empire, for as long as your clemency shall live, simply to satisfy — to the extent only that it has been enjoined upon them — presuming to add nothing, to change nothing, to diminish nothing, but simply to set forth the tradition of the Apostolic See as it was established by the pontiffs, its predecessors."* Such was the commission he gave.

It therefore appears that the definition made at the **VI** Synod was first defined at the Roman synod, and — as you have it in the letter of Agatho, which was written in his own name and that of the whole synod — it appears that Pope Martin in his preceding synod, which we have in its entirety, had first condemned those who held one will in Christ. Since, therefore, this letter is of such authority that it contains the definition, in no way should it be said that it is of less authority than the canons.

Indeed, from this fourth letter testimonies are gathered. Thus the whole Synod of Constantinople, the whole of it, says: *"The prince of the Apostles strove most earnestly with us; we had as our author his imitator and the successor of his see; and while the ancient city of Rome offered you the confession divinely inscribed to you by God — illuminating the mystery of the sacrament through letters — and the chart brought forth the day of doctrines from the western regions, it appeared that Peter was speaking through Agatho."*

It must therefore be said that these decretal letters, sent in such great matters of faith, contain the truth and contain nothing false, and are of great authority. And to make an end — since your paternity agrees with me on this, that what we say

should be confirmed by the testimony of the great holy fathers — I adduce two great testimonies to show that the decretal letters written by the supreme pontiffs at various times were received with veneration, and that through such letters from the beginning of the nascent Church up to the Nicene council — and of Clement and Anacletus and up to those times — their authority was as great as that of any holy doctor. Therefore Augustine, in the book *On Christian Doctrine*, says that "*in the canonical*" writings "*of the Catholic churches*" he follows most fully "*the authority*" of the primary scriptures, "*among which*" the canonical scriptures "*are also those letters which the Apostolic See merited to receive*" from its own pontiffs who sat in it, and which others merited to receive from that see itself. So that these letters, according to Augustine, are placed among the Catholic scriptures. Indeed, it is said further that neither Augustine nor Ambrose nor any other doctor defends their opinion against the authority of these letters. This I wished to say as a foundation for what is to be said, so that you may recognize that the Roman Church, founded in Christ through blessed Peter, has always proceeded with great gravity, and has affirmed its declarations from solid foundations. This concerns that objection.

Response to the First Objection: The Meaning of "Head," "Father," and "Teacher"

Now to your first argument I respond as follows. When you say that the Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff appears to be successor of Peter and vicar of Christ, and father and teacher and master of Christians — as has been set forth in the preceding disputation — that these words are found in letters, and that it does not seem necessary to declare them further, but only to state the force of the words:

The Emperor was saying through the word of the Nicene bishop: you say that he is father and teacher and master of Christians. We would wish to understand whether these words denote a certain reverence — because he is first among all the patriarchs, so that we may render honor to him as to one great lord — or whether some power beyond reverence is implied, because the document says: *head of the Church*.

I respond, with the correction of our most holy Lord and of others, that this preeminence denotes not only reverence but a certain power of a certain obedience; and this is shown first through divine Scripture and through your own texts.

For whoever is set over any multitude — whether called head, or master, or teacher — as long as he is made prelate over the multitude, a certain power is always given. And that Peter was placed above all the Apostles is clear: first, from the authority of that most glorious man himself — Chrysostom — who, expounding the authority of John *"Feed my sheep"* (John 21:17), and we have the Greek original, says: *"Passing over the others, the Lord spoke with Peter about such things. For Peter was the chief of the Apostles and the mouth of the disciples and the head of our college"*; and with the negation removed, he commits to him the prelacy of the brothers, saying: *"Feed my sheep."* Third, he is the president of the fathers. If, therefore, he commits to him the prelacy of the Apostles and makes him the president of all — from this foundation it follows that obedience is owed to him as to a prelate.

Likewise, of how great authority most blessed Pope Leo is, both in the Eastern and Western Church, is well established — of whom the Council of Chalcedon says: *"God provided for us an invulnerable champion of all error, preparing the Prelate of the Roman Church for victory and assisting him in all things with the doctrines of truth"* (Council of Chalcedon, address to Emperor Marcian). And in the Roman synod, Pope Adrian says: *"the judgment of that Leo, whatever is true and Catholic, the world admires and celebrates and venerates as a heavenly miracle."*

Pope Leo says in the first sermon of the Ascension, which begins *"After the blessed resurrection,"* says: *"The days which passed between the Resurrection of the Lord and His Ascension did not pass in idle decourse; in these days, after the Lord's breathing, the Holy Spirit is poured out upon all, and to the blessed Apostle Peter above the rest, through the keys of the kingdom, the care of the Lord's flock is committed."* See, therefore, how Peter was made the prelate of all the Apostles and above all — which is in the words *"I will give you the keys"* (Mt. 16:19) and *"Feed my sheep"* (John 21:17). So say these doctors; and by this it is said: *head* denotes superiority with respect to the other members.

I wish to adduce this from your own books. I find in the VI Synod that blessed Pope Agatho, in his supplication — after adducing testimonies of many fathers — places as the final testimony that of Emperor Justinian, because he had issued many laws in favor of the faith against the Acephalites, who were Eutychianists. He placed those laws in his own volumes and made certain titles on ecclesiastical titles and against heretics and Manichaeans; and because they are placed in his books, they are cited as testimonies of the holy fathers. From those you have that Justinian understood the Roman Pontiff to be the head of all the churches. For in the book on the Highest Trinity, in the letter *Inter claras*, he says: *"We hasten to subject all the priests of the Eastern region to the see of your Holiness, because it is the head of all the holy churches"*; and he adds: *"through all things we hasten, as has been said, to increase the honor and authority of your see."*

If, therefore, Justinian says this — then by this reasoning, because he is called head, prelacy is denoted in him and obedience in others. Therefore in the same title, John writes to Justinian saying: *"Among the bright praises of the wisdom of your gentleness, it shines with clearer light like a star, that taught by love of faith and the pursuit of charity in ecclesiastical disciplines, you preserve the reverence of the Roman See and subject all things to it and bring them to its unity — whose author, that is the first of the Apostles, was commanded by the Lord saying: 'Feed my sheep' (John 21:17) — and the rules and ordinances of the fathers declare and the most reverend address of your piety testifies that he is the head and father of all the churches."*

It has been defined that he is the head. What this power is, Paul says: *"Obey your prelates and be subject to them, for they keep watch over your souls as those who will render an account"* (Heb. 13:17).

The Nature of Spiritual Jurisdiction

Wherefore this power which is in Peter and his successors is called the power of spiritual jurisdiction, which is ordained for the salvation of the souls of all Christians, so that through this power the sacraments may be administered to the faithful according to the proper order. Concerning this power all — both clergy and laity — are subject: the laity in those things which concern the salvation of the soul, as for example if they have sinned mortally, it belongs principally to the

spiritual pastor to correct and draw them back, as a father. And likewise if they were to act against the faith — as certain emperors who were heretics persecuted metropolitans, and it was necessary to have recourse to the Apostolic See — and in similar cases, since the end of the Apostolic See is the peace of the ecclesiastical state, so that through this peace the heavenly glory may be attained.

For this reason Christ said: *"I will give you the keys"* (Mt. 16:19), and made him the shepherd to lead the sheep to the pastures of heavenly life. And examples of this kind fill all the synods.

You know how many persecutions Athanasius and his followers suffered from the Emperor Constantine, who was an Arian. They had recourse to holy Felix and Pope Julius, who with all charity and solicitude, as heads of the Church, defended him. Likewise John Chrysostom suffered persecution and was always protected by the Apostolic See. Flavian appealed at the **ii** Synod of Ephesus — and so it appears that this does not rather prejudice the power of the emperor, because that is in civil and temporal matters, while this is ecclesiastical and spiritual. For this reason the laws of emperors are called civil, and those of churchmen canonical; and these are two powers, each of which helps the other. Therefore Leo says: *"Human affairs cannot otherwise be secure, unless what pertains to divine knowledge is defended by both royal and priestly authority."* And therefore it is said that God made two great lights; and since the spiritual power is nobler by reason of its end — which is heaven — this power is likened to the sun, the other to the moon, by reason of its earthly end.

Let these suffice for now: that by those words *father*, *head*, and *teacher* we understand not only reverence but also power; and so it is said *to feed* and *to rule* on account of this power.

The Power of Convening — Response to a Further Difficulty

Another difficulty which the Emperor raised was this: we placed in the document the word *of convening* — whether the power of convening the Church belongs to this power or not. And since I considered this part to be beyond doubt, I said but little concerning it, adducing only the testimony of the fathers of the Chalcedonian Council writing the encyclical letter — subscribed by all — narrating to Pope Leo

what Dioscorus had done, saying that among other evils he "*devised excommunication against him who had hastened to unite the body of the Church.*" If, therefore, they say that Leo had united the Church, this seems sufficient. But I adduce another irrefutable testimony, and afterward I shall declare what this uniting means.

That blessed Pope Julius — whose authority is cited in the **iii** ecumenical synod — writing to all the Easterners says: "*To the first see of the Church, the rights of convening synods of the churches and of judging bishops have been granted by singular privilege through evangelical, apostolic, and canonical institutions.*" It also appears that Julius says the power of convening is founded on evangelical and apostolic authorities; and he adds: "*This see is set before all the churches, which has obtained singular primacy not only by the decrees of the canons and the holy fathers, but by the very voice of our Lord the Savior: 'You are', he says, 'Peter, and upon this rock'*" etc. (Mt. 16:18). He introduces these evangelical authorities, and since so great a prince and the synod have expounded these authorities, his testimony can in no way be refuted.

For if the Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff is the shepherd, should he not — if he is to feed the universal Church — necessarily have the power of convening when it is expedient? A material shepherd, if he wishes to lead his sheep, convenes them in one place and directs them. So here the spiritual shepherd could not belong to the supreme pontiff unless, when necessity arose, he could convoke from all parts of the world. And these convocations take place only in the greatest necessities of the whole Church — for example, when great heresies arise — since it belongs to the Pope, who has authority over the earth and over the Church, while the other patriarchs have authority only over a certain part. Hence it is expedient, in his judgment, that these convocations take place; and that "*Feed*" is to strengthen them, lest they fail in faith. Assemblies are held; it is not expedient that individuals come, but the principal ones are convoked and come with authority. This testimony proves that he has the right of convening.

Response to Two Objections: The Role of Emperors and the Five Patriarchs

There are two objections: the first concerning emperors, the second concerning the other patriarchs, who think the Church is constituted in five patriarchs.

To the first I respond: even if emperors convened councils — when they had the monarchy of the lord — we say this: namely, that they did so in execution, with the consent and command of the Pope. I prove this from the authority of Pope Leo. For he himself pressed for the Chalcedonian Synod to be assembled, and wrote many letters to the emperor asking him to convene a council, because the Church had been wounded at the **ii** Synod of Ephesus — which he condemned — and he made the definition which was obtained at Chalcedon. He had never been able to obtain this from Theodosius; but when Theodosius died and Valentinian and Marcian became emperors, they immediately wrote to Leo — whether it was his will — and said: *"We believe it just to address your Holiness first in sacred letters, as one who holds the primacy in the episcopate by divine command, inviting and beseeching you that your Holiness implore the eternal divinity for the firmness of our empire, so that we may have such a purpose and desire that — with every doubt of error driven away through the celebration of a synod, with you as its author — the greatest peace among the bishops of the Church may be made, safe from all crime and standing inviolate."*

So Pope Leo, after the celebration of the council, responding to the letter by which he was asked to confirm the acts of the council, says: *"Let the whole brotherhood and the hearts of the faithful know — indeed not only through the presidents who carried out my voice, but also through the approval of the synodal acts — that I have had my own judgment together with you in the sole cause of faith, which must often be said, for which alone a general council was pleased to be assembled, even at the command of the Christian princes and with the consent of the Apostolic See."*

The primary cause acting proceeded from the Apostolic See; but for execution the secular arm is required. And so the emperor commanded at the request of Leo; the primary cause of assembly in ecclesiastical matters is attributed to the authority of the Apostolic See. And in the same way now the Apostolic See acts and observes, because having made a convocation, it writes to kings and princes that they should command or urge people to come; and those are the executors of the mandates of the Apostolic See — they are called executors of the power of the Church. The Apostolic See has much to attend to on this matter.

The Patriarchs and the Primacy of Rome

As for the other patriarchs — I have never read in writings or in councils that governance belongs to three or five patriarchs. This power would not be well ordered, because Christ ordered the Church well; and since monarchical governance is better, from the fact that He placed one over the Apostles, He did not wish **IV** or **V** — He wished it to be exercised through one.

And I adduce the testimony of most blessed Pope Anacletus, who was ordained a priest by Peter, who was Greek by birth, and was the successor of Clement. He wrote many decretals and writes thus concerning the ordinance of Christ — after saying, as I said yesterday, that this Roman Church received the primacy not from the Apostles but from Christ — he shows that the Apostles also wished this and says: *"Among the most blessed Apostles there was a certain distinction of power; although all were Apostles, it was granted by the Lord to Peter to preside over all the Apostles — Cephas and head — and they handed down this same form to be maintained by their successors."* And so he says: that by reason of the power granted to Peter, *"the Roman Church is the hinge and head"* of all the churches. And he adds: the second church is Alexandria, which was instituted by Peter, who sent his disciple Mark, who by Peter's authority founded it; therefore it is the first daughter of the Roman Church, because Peter instituted it. And he adds: the third is Antioch, solely by reason of reverence for Peter, because for a certain time he presided there; then, moved by the impulse of the Holy Spirit, he departed and *"established there holy Ignatius as bishop."* Wherefore no other patriarch could have power there but Ignatius, nor in Alexandria but Mark.

These are the daughters of the Roman Church, and Peter is the guardian, head, and defender of those churches. In the course of time the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Constantinople were established, because from the beginning these two had none. But at the **IV** Synod they began to treat that there should be a second — and they took the power from Alexandria, which had been the second — and they argued that this matter had been raised at the **ii** Synod. And yet many years passed, because Pope Damasus never wished to confirm it, nor did his successors until Leo, because they did not wish to disturb the Nicene canons, by which it was said that the privileges of the churches should be preserved; nor could it be called

patriarchal, because the Pope did not consent. Afterward Leo consented, and Justinian later made a law that Constantinople should be the second in the title *On sacrosanct churches*, in the law *Sancimus*. Therefore according to these ancient rights, that church too is a daughter of the Roman Church and honored with many privileges; nor does the Roman Church wish to disturb its privileges — indeed it wishes to preserve the privileges of it and all the other churches. Therefore, for the completion of the union, Justinian in the authentic in the title *That the Roman Church* says: "*Ancient Rome has obtained the origin of the laws and the summit of the supreme pontiff and the source of the priesthood — no one doubts this.*" If, therefore, it is the source of the priesthood, then just as streams are derived from a source, so the other churches as daughters are called into a share of solicitude to preserve the unity of the Church — they have their origin from that source.

It was then said by the Lord of Nicaea: if this power which is given to the head — is it the same kind as that given to one metropolitan in his own metropolis, and to one patriarch in his own patriarchate?

I respond that it is not the same; because the powers of the metropolitan and patriarchal churches are limited to certain parts, so that one patriarch has no power in the territory of another patriarch, and vice versa. But the successor of Peter has immediate superior power over all — yet in such a way that all these things happen with order; so that when greater and more difficult causes — which cannot be handled by metropolitans, and when subjects are sometimes burdened beyond reason — an ordinance has been made according to divine institution, so that recourse may always be had to the Apostolic See for doctrine, declaration, and judgment. Because the order of power has respect to one first; and so the powers are regulated, because since he himself cannot by himself supply everything, he has arranged ordained powers — as it was in the old law, since Moses was over all the Jews; yet since he could not supply everything for all, he established certain others.

Hence it is said in a certain letter which Pope Leo writes to the bishop of Thessalonica: "*We entrust our place to you in such a way that it is a share of solicitude, not a plenitude of power*" — he has no jurisdiction except over his own. Anacletus and Clement say thus: that through Peter the patriarchal, metropolitan, and episcopal sees were instituted — as is established in those texts — in those

cities where, they say, Peter wished the patriarchal sees to be where there had been chief priests; and where there had been no chief priests, Peter wished metropolitans to be; and afterward in individual cities he wished there to be bishops. Since, therefore, Peter ordained these dignities, it belongs rightly and meritoriously to the Pope alone, and not to the other patriarchs.

If they have any texts of the saints and councils which say something concerning the patriarchal sees, let them bring them forward, and a response shall be given. Because all our holy doctors have wished this, and through no power could the authority of the see be diminished — but that which was in Peter, it shall always have and hold, according to the judgment of the holy doctors, until the end of the age. And therefore the sixth canon of the Nicene Council says that the Roman Church has always held the primacy. Let this suffice.

INTERPRETER. They suffice for me as well.

CARDINAL. For an understanding of whether those words give jurisdiction or veneration, hear blessed John Chrysostom.

ANDREAS. It was read in Greek.

ARATHENSIS. None of us denies that without the power of the Roman Pontiff a council cannot be convoked. But on the contrary — the Pope without the patriarchs?

CARDINAL. What if the others in their canons were to contradict? Would it be assembled by the command of the Pope?

ARATHENSIS. On account of this they will not desist from there being a council.

CARDINAL. And without the Pope there will be no council.

PROVINCIALIS. Those canons are nothing but apocryphal.

ARATHENSIS. We shall consider these things and report them to the Emperor.

CARDINAL. Do you not have the privilege of Constantine, which he made for Sylvester?

ARATHENSIS. Yes.

CARDINAL. Read it.

ANDREAS. The Archbishop of Colocz read the privilege in Greek, the words of which privilege were rendered into Latin as follows.

ANDREAS. When these things had been set forth, the Lord John of Torquemada began in this manner.

Second Address of John of Torquemada on the Form of the Most Holy Eucharist

TORQUEMADA. By the mandate of our most holy Lord, I shall make a brief address and shall use very few words — setting aside many things and touching briefly on what is to the point. The Emperor, responding to what had been put forward by the reverend Lord Cardinal, said among other things that that clause — that the sacrament was confected by the words of the Savior alone — could not be placed there. When this response was reported to our most holy Lord, both his Beatitude and the fathers were not a little astonished that this statement should be considered impossible, since this addition contains the conditions which the holy fathers established for things to be defined by a synod.

First, truth; second, necessity; third, utility; fourth, charity — which causes no offense to anyone.

i. That This Addition Contains Truth

That this addition contains truth was shown yesterday by many authorities of the holy Greek doctors: first, of most blessed Chrysostom, who says that the words transform into Christ; the same is the opinion of Dionysius and Damascene. And the authority of Ambrose was adduced, who puts this matter plainly — who after many things says thus: that when the sacrament is confected, *"the priest does not use his own words but the words of Christ, saying: 'This is my body and my blood'"* (Mt. 26:27–28) — concluding that the sacrament is confected by these words, with many authorities. In the book *On the Sacraments* he says that the word of Christ

changes the creature on the altar. Likewise, the sacrament receives what it receives from the word of Christ. Eusebius of Emesa says: *"The invisible priest changes the visible creatures, saying: 'Take' etc."*

The same Augustine in many places; in the book *On the Words of the Lord*, chapter **XXVIII**: *"Before the words of consecration, it is bread; after the words of Christ, it is not bread but the body of Christ."* Likewise in the sermon on the body of Christ: *"Within the Catholic Church, nothing greater is confected by a good priest, nothing lesser by a bad priest, because the sacrament is confected not by the merit of the consecrator but by the word of the Savior."* And I pass over the other authorities.

Augustine says: *"By the rest of what is said in the Mass, praise is given; petition is made for common needs, for the people and for others; and the sacrament is not confected when one uses one's own words, but the words of Christ."* See, therefore, that these most illustrious and most holy doctors, in treating of this sacrament, say that the sacrament is confected in the words of the Savior alone.

And one common argument is placed by holy Thomas, by which it should be known to all, even to common people: because the same canon was not in use among all people in perpetuity, but was added through various times by the pontiffs. Hence our Mass is said to have had its beginning from blessed Peter, who is said to have placed in the canon only a very brief prayer. Afterward, through the holy doctors, additions of prayers were made — from which it is manifestly argued that the consecration of this most worthy sacrament is not accomplished perfectly by the words of the saints, which received variety over time, but by the words of God, which have always remained uniformly the same.

ii. Responses to Three Objections

Other arguments were made yesterday and I do not repeat them, but I only respond to some of the motives put forward in opposition. And these are **iii**: the first the authority of Dionysius, the other of Damascene, the **iii** of Basil.

Concerning what is said first — that Dionysius says the priest about to sacrifice the sacrament excuses himself from the dignity of the ministry, as not being worthy, saying: *"Lord, You commanded: 'Do this in remembrance of me'"* (1 Cor. 11:25) —

this argues nothing to the effect that the sacrament is confected by other words; because one who argues thus — that from those words "*do this*" it follows that other priests can do this — when the priest excuses himself, it is said that this consequence does not hold. These words have a different order whenever they appear in the Gospels than the words of the priest in excusing himself; and so it is clear that from the words of Dionysius no consequence follows that the sacrament can be confected by words other than those of Christ.

Nor does the statement of Damascene proceed — that it is confected through the invocation of the power of the Holy Spirit — because by "invocation" Damascene does not understand another prayer that follows the words of Christ in the confection, but understands "invocation" — according to the opinion of Dionysius — as the form of the sacrament, which consists in the words of Christ. Hence, at the end of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, he calls the words of Christ which confect the sacrament the form of the sacraments; and they consider this form to be the invocation.

I wish to show that the words of Basil cannot be the form of consecration, and that no one should be moved by those words to believe otherwise. First thus: although Basil made that prayer, he never asserted that the consecration was accomplished by those words; nor should it be believed that so holy a man supposed that so wondrous and incredible a sacrament was brought about in his own words.

Second, it is argued from the order of the words. The words of Basil follow the words of Christ. Are the words of Christ completing words or not? It cannot be said that they are not perfect — since the word of Christ is most perfect and needs no addition of a human word. Indeed the whole argument of blessed Damascene in his treatise on the sacraments — to prove that the sacrament is confected by the words of Christ — says that the word of the Lord is life-giving; and just as He said "*Let there be light*" (Gen. 1:3) and there was light, so when He says "*This is my body*" (Mt. 26:26), the sacrament is made.

Third, I show it from the form of the words themselves. These are the words of Basil: "*We ask and beseech You and supplicate You: send the Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts set before you*" etc. (Basil, Liturgy). These words are supplicatory — that God may do something supernatural. It is clear that in those

words of supplication there is no form of making. So that it may be better understood, take an example from Scripture. The Canaanite woman, in supplicating for her daughter's liberation, said: *"Have mercy on me, son of David"* (Mt. 15:22). Christ responded: *"Let it be done as you wish"* (Mt. 15:28). I ask: by which words was the healing accomplished? It is clear — by those words: *"let it be done"* etc. I ask for absolution: *"Father."* The answer is: *"I absolve you."* I am not freed by the supplicatory words. The prayer of Basil is deprecatory — that God may send the Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts set before Him, and may make the bread His venerable body. Who would say that the consecration takes place by these words — especially since blessed Dionysius says that the words of consecration have active powers? Words of supplication cannot have active operations. No one can say that the sacrament is consecrated by the words of Basil, but by the words of Christ.

It remains that we should know what the meaning of Basil was. That prayer is not so that the consecration may take place — for it has already taken place — but so that we may follow the effect of the sacrament: to be united and incorporated, and to say with the Apostle: *"I live, no longer I, but Christ lives in me"* (Gal. 2:20). Basil says: *"We ask and supplicate: send the Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts set before You, so that they may be for our salvation, and may make this bread"* — that is, the assembly of the faithful.

ARATHENSIS. The words are different, namely: *"send Your Holy Spirit to bless and to offer."*

TORQUEMADA. By *"this bread"* we understand the mystical body of the Church, as the Lord Cardinal said before the Emperor. Bread is taken in two senses: true material bread and mystical bread. Concerning this mystical bread the Apostle says: *"We are all one body and one bread, we who partake of one bread"* (1 Cor. 10:17); as Augustine says: *"The Church is called one body, one bread"* — because just as bread is composed of many grains and a body of many members, so the Church is composed of many faithful through the working of charity.

Second, know that although the bread is consecrated by reason of those species, the understanding to be had here is this: *"make this bread"* — that is, make the Christian faithful, figured by this bread, to be incorporated into Your holy body and

united to it, so that they may be vivified by Your Spirit; because no one lives by the Spirit of Christ unless he is the body of Christ. And it follows that this may become for those who communicate from them.

ARATHENSIS. From which people?

TORQUEMADA. The body of Christ is understood as consisting of those who communicate from it; and that prayer is referred to this: that the faithful who communicate in the true body of Christ and His blood may obtain the remission of sins and the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven.

ARATHENSIS. Let us look at the words, to see whether this exposition follows well from the words — when it says: "*and make this bread the mystical body of Your Christ.*"

CARDINAL. "*To be Your venerable body.*"

TORQUEMADA. The bread itself — the mystical body of Christ — understood through that material bread.

NICENE BISHOP. You say: "*make this bread*" — that is, the body of Your Church — "*to be incorporated into Your true body through the dignity of grace?*"

TORQUEMADA. Yes.

ARATHENSIS. How do we accommodate what follows, where it says: "*and may it become for those who receive*" — explain this; and how is the same thing repeated?

TORQUEMADA. The prayer is this: make it so that through the participation of Your true body, Your mystical body may obtain the remission of sins, the grace of the Holy Spirit, and eternal beatitude. This is the meaning of the words of Basil and Chrysostom, and in this sense there is no difficulty between you and us.

iii. That the Clause Must Be Placed Out of Necessity

I proceed to the second part: that out of necessity that clause must be placed. And this is the condition — that there is necessity — which is argued from two things.

First, because the matter has come into controversy in so great an assembly, and it is necessary that no one be able to carry a scruple away, so that this synodal agreement may be clarifying and unifying between us.

Second, from those things which are required for the perfection of the sacrament — and these are **IV**: first, the matter, namely unleavened or leavened bread; second, the form, namely the words; third, the minister, namely the priest; fourth, right intention, so that he intends to confect. Since, therefore, three are placed in the document, it is opportune that the fourth be placed as well, lest the provision seem defective and less than wise — especially since the form holds the primacy among the four.

iv. The Utility and Charity of the Addition

The third condition is utility: the instruction of all the faithful, and especially of simple priests of both churches, so that all may know that this most adorable sacrament is confected in the words of the Savior.

Finally, charity: because this definition offends no one, neither one church nor the other — and it is common to both.

POPE. Since the hour is late, what has been said was said on account of what the Emperor said yesterday. And regarding where the primacy of the Apostolic See is concerned, I believe you will have fully understood it from the most ancient synodal authorities. As for the second part, which the second doctor spoke of — although it was not necessary to treat of the words of Basil, since these will be explained on another occasion — nonetheless I do not think anyone is so little understanding as to believe that the body of Christ can be confected by any words other than those of our Savior. I am not speaking of the arguments of Ambrose and Jerome; consider the consequence — that before those doctors the body of Christ would not have been confected, and no one would say this. We believe that you are learned and have an obligation to render account of souls. I exhort your charities to think on these arguments and to confer with the Emperor and give the conclusion of this holy union, so that the common joy may be made full — so that we may be free to attend to the expedition of the Emperor and the matters that follow. And the

sooner this is done, the better the outcome will appear to the whole of Christendom.

ANDREAS. The Lord Archbishop of Russia spoke.

Metropolitan of Russia. I ask your lordships to grant me the opportunity to speak.

POPE. It is agreeable.

Metropolitan of Russia. If I thought there was any contradiction between what has been said by the master, I would make a long speech. For in the case of contradictions, it is necessary either to confirm or to refute. But since I think that with God's help we are in agreement, I shall dispose of the matter briefly through three points that I shall make.

First, I speak of the time involved. For this missal which we use was handed down by Basil and blessed Chrysostom; we used it before the time of the schism, and no change was made. Yet the Western Church never said a word about this — and since we were in agreement and tending toward the same end, as our people considered, and our people seeing that the Roman Church always permitted this, it therefore seems that in terms of time we are in agreement. According to the matter we say the same thing; and I say that we believe that what confects the ministry is the word of the Lord, and in this way we say through the prayer of the priest that the sacrament is effected in this way. And since we believe the dominical voice to be the producer of the divine gifts — and having been spoken once by God, for whose purpose that voice always operates — it is always repeated by the priest; and the priest receives what is appropriate, so that the repeated voice may be fitted to be the same voice as the voice of the Lord. And so that it may be thus fitted, the Holy Spirit is invoked, and the priest supplicates that through the power of the Holy Spirit grace may be granted — so that the repeated voice may become as effective as the word of God was. And so we believe that the consummation is brought about through that prayer of the priest.

And I prove that the dominical voices have operation as seeds do — because without seed no fruit can be produced; so in this dominical voice. But where the seed falls, it needs other instruments — such as the prayer, the altar, and the other prayers. Hence we believe that by this we are in agreement with you.

As for what is added in the definition — for your reasons your paternity has said it is necessary on account of the disagreement — I say that it would be necessary if this difficulty were a matter of contradiction; but it has not been raised in such a way as to produce disputations. And therefore, since there have been no controversies about it, why should it be brought into doubt?

On the other part: in which **IV** things are considered for the confection of the sacrament — we sense the same as you, that what is required is wheat bread and wine from the vine, and a priest, and an altar, and principally the dominical words. And since in all these things we are in agreement, you say it should be placed for the instruction of the simple. The simple have always held this clearly and will continue to do so; wherefore it is not necessary to place this in the definition. For there are many questions also about baptism; if we wished to provide for all of them, time would not suffice. Since I have said these things on my own account, I beseech our most holy Lord and the reverend fathers that no further definition be required.

TORQUEMADA. I heard with great joy the wisdom of so great a father, because I heard his paternity confessing that the sacrament is confectioned by the words of the Savior and that the words of the Savior alone are the maker and operator of the sacrament. Second, he seemed to say that the words of Basil work in the manner of prayer, not in the manner of active power. *"The priest prays,"* he says, *"that the word uttered by me may have that power of transubstantiating the bread into the body of Christ, and so that this sacrament may be consummated — it is said that the words of Basil operate."* He placed the example of seeds, which, though they have active power, nonetheless need other operations such as prayer and the altar.

What his paternity has said does not hold on two counts. The first argument I make from my own reasoning — which was taken from the order of the words of Basil in relation to the words of Basil — is this: a thing already received, I do not supplicate to be given. If they preceded, I would believe they concurred for the consecration, as we say in our canon, namely *"that it may become the body and blood"* etc. We also ask — but after the words of Christ have been uttered, words of supplication do not follow so that the consecration may take place. Hence a supplication follows, that the consecrated body of Christ may become for us salutary. Since, therefore, the words of Basil follow the consecration, they cannot

have the words of supplication in the sense that what has already been done may come to be.

The second argument is that the argument does not address the point, because the words of Christ do not have incomplete power as seeds do — but His word is living and needs no operator. And therefore that argument does not seem to favor his intention.

What I say — that, saving the peace of your paternity, it seems necessary — is this: because as has been said, the matter has been brought into the midst and contradicted, so that it not be placed. Since this concerns one of the principal sacraments of our faith, and from the profession of this faith such great contention has arisen, it seems necessary that those **IV** things be addressed, which I say are necessary: minister, matter, words, and intention. But without an altar and without sacred vestments the sacrament can be confected — although one who consecrated in such a way would sin — and therefore the confection cannot be perfect unless these **IV** things concur.

ANDREAS. The hour being now late, and the Pontiff rising, we all rose. And with all the Greek presidents rising, the Pope exhorted them that they should come to some effective agreement and be willing to accept the forms.

On the twenty-first day, at the twenty-first hour, the Emperor came to the Supreme Pontiff, and said there that he believed in the **IV** articles and was in agreement with us on all of them — but that he wished to treat the article on the primacy in a certain way.

Acts of 26 June 1439

ANDREAS. On the twenty-sixth day of June, the most reverend Lord Cardinals and prelates having convened in one room of the palace, and the Lord Emperor and the Greeks in another hall of the same palace, among our people the Lord Cardinal of Piacenza began in this manner.

CARDINAL OF PIACENZA. It has seemed good to our Lord and to the Emperor — so that the business of the union of the Greeks may be more easily dispatched — that there should be six from each side who, together with our Lord and the Emperor, may treat the conclusion of these matters; and if any difficulties should

arise, that they be reported publicly to your fatherhoods, so that they may be resolved by the judgment of all.

Therefore it seems that the six deputies should be: the Lord of Santa Sabina, the Lord of Morinensis, the Lord of León, the Lord Provincial of Lombardy, the Lord John of Torquemada, and the Lord Thomas of Sarzana.

ANDREAS. When these words had been set forth, those six rose and went to the Pope; and the others were told to wait, receiving the situation with charitable patience. And a certain person was sent to report to the Emperor, so that he might send his own people — and he immediately designated his own six: namely the Lord of Herakleia, the Lord Archbishop of Russia, the Lord ..., the Lord of Nicaea, and two priests. These entered the Pope's chamber where our own deputies were stationed. They waited for a long time; finally, the Greeks having returned to their own people and our men to ours, the Lord of Santa Sabina began thus: *"Reverend fathers, since the report is lengthy, and the hour is already the seventeenth, it seems that we should convene tomorrow morning and the report of the conclusions may be given."*

ANDREAS. The heat and warmth were very great past midday; wherefore each one departed most willingly — indeed, since everyone was weakened and nearly failing from the great heat. And since it was already the eighteenth hour, a certain restorative refreshment of drink was provided there for both Latins and Greeks who wished it, to revive their spirits.

Acts of 27 June 1439

On the twenty-seventh day, with all assembled in the apostolic palace in the main chapel — the Supreme Pontiff being present along with all our people — the Supreme Pontiff, having summoned the Lord of Santa Sabina, told him to prepare himself to set forth everything. Thereupon our aforementioned Lord the Pope spoke.

POPE. As you know, long and great labor has been undertaken so that we might come to the end of this holy union with these Easterners — and now it has been fifteen months. At last, after many disputations held and negotiations and labors

undertaken by those who participated, by the mercy of God the matter has been brought to a good end. It has not seemed fitting up to now to occupy everyone with all things; now that the matter has been concluded, we have decided that the Lord of Santa Sabina should make the report, so that you may see how greatly our Lord Jesus Christ has worked. Afterward we shall deliberate on what is to be done.

ANDREAS. The Cardinal of Santa Sabina began in this manner:

Address of Cardinal Julian Cesarini, 27 June 1439

CARDINAL. Most blessed Father. By the mandate of your Holiness, I shall set forth, as best I can, what your Holiness has commanded — though I would have wished this task had been assigned to another who might report more fully.

Your Holiness and the reverend fathers know that it has now been five hundred years since there were great differences between the holy Roman Church and the Eastern Church.

- i.** First, concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit — whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.
- ii.** Second, concerning the addition — whether those words could be added to the creed, even if they were true.
- iii.** The third difference: whether the body of the Lord could be confectioned in unleavened bread.
- iv.** Fourth, concerning purgatory — and this has many parts.
- v.** The fifth difference: concerning the primacy of the Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff.

History of the Disputes

And concerning these things, innumerable treatises have been made — both by Latins against Greeks and by Greeks against Latins. And, as you know, there were very bitter hatreds between the Western and Eastern churches; each called the other

heretical, and many censures were made by the holy Roman Church against the same Greeks and Easterners, who differed from the Roman Church, the mother of them all.

i. Purgatory

When the Greeks came to this holy council, the matter of purgatory was disputed; and as is well known to those who were present, there were many differences. First, there were those who said there was no place of purgatory, but that the souls were in certain places awaiting the day of judgment; and who said that neither the souls of the blessed saw God, nor the souls of the damned went to hell before the day of judgment. From these matters many disputations arose — indeed, they even said that not even the angels saw God.

ii. The Addition to the Creed

Afterward the matter of the addition was disputed; and since this was public, I do not report it.

iii. The Procession of the Holy Spirit

Third came the matter of the procession of the Holy Spirit — and that was public, as you heard.

But finally it seemed good to the Lord Emperor and the Greeks to cease from disputation and to come to definite negotiations, hoping that a conclusion might be given thereby. And they wished that the participants should be few. And since, in order to comply with their wish, it was not possible to summon all your fatherhoods, certain deputies were appointed. And since the matter of the procession was the weightier one, several negotiations began with it, hoping that once that was concluded, not much difference would remain in the others.

Many difficulties and many approaches were put forward. First, the Greeks said that it should be defined that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son; this path was rejected by the deputies for many reasons. Another way was proposed — that it be confessed there that both we hold our position rightly and

that they hold theirs rightly according to their own understanding. This path was rejected by us, because truth admits no division. Then another was given: that it be declared that the Holy Spirit both flows and proceeds from the Father and the Son — the Greeks being averse to the word "*proceeding*"; and this path was rejected by us, because these words would be subject to doubt, and therefore should not be placed in a definition. Then it was said that the difference was not whether the Holy Spirit emanated or did not emanate or flowed forth, but whether He "*proceeded*" — and therefore the contention that existed should not be defined by these words. Then it was proposed that it be defined that He proceeds from the Father and the Son and from the Father through the Son; and this way was not seen as good, because a bad interpretation could be made — that the word "*and*" might be expounded as "*through*."

It was said that this way would declare that the Son is the cause — and that this was not a good manner of pronouncing, because the meaning would be ambiguous, which ought to be certain.

The deputies of our most holy Lord and of your fatherhoods always stood firm that the difficulty be defined according to the dogma of the holy Roman Church. And after many labors, at times we were closer to despair than to conclusion. But because God wills it to be known that all things proceed from Himself — when we were in greatest discord — those Greek lords gave their assent to the document of the deputies.

Wherefore we have reason to render thanks to God that they assented so simply to our document. And although at the Council of Lyons it was concluded that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, here in our document it is said that He was eternally from the Father and the Son, and more words — as contained in the document — which remove several difficulties.

iv. The Addition to the Creed

Then, this matter having been settled, they came to another: since the matter of the addition had been raised, it seemed right that it be synodally defined that the addition was lawful. And in this there was great difficulty, which four hours would

scarcely suffice to narrate. At length it was concluded that they should confess that the addition or declaration was justly and well made.

v. Purgatory

As for the matter of purgatory, it was not disputed publicly, but among certain deputies — and quite solemnly. And since many difficulties appeared, I almost despaired; at last, by the working of God, the Greeks now confess the truth: namely, that those who depart in charity and have not made satisfaction for the penances enjoined upon them, or who die in some venial sin, go to purgatory; if they die in mortal sin, they go immediately to hell; if they die without sin and after receiving baptism, they pass immediately to heaven.

But the Greeks held that those souls did not see God Himself, but certain radiances; and in this there was a great difficulty — so great that it nearly disrupted the whole business. At last they recognized through arguments that the souls of the blessed will see God, triune and one, as He is; but they wished it to be added in the document that some see less perfectly and others more — and this was seen fit to be admitted, because *"in my Father's house there are many mansions"* (John 14:2).

vi. Unleavened and Leavened Bread

Another difference was concerning unleavened bread, because even among the Greeks some did not wish that the sacrament be confectioned in unleavened bread, saying that God used leavened bread. At last it was concluded that the sacrament be confectioned in both unleavened and leavened bread; and having heard the arguments, they gave their assent — as is fully established above in the disputation on this matter already reported.

vii. The Form of Consecration

And so that all might be publicly established, another difficulty arose which nearly disrupted the whole work — and this question had never been raised before. For when our Lord was informed that the Greeks in the confection of the sacrament used certain other prayers, it seemed good to his Holiness that their intention be

known — whether they held those prayers to be of the substance of the consecration. And having heard our arguments, they confessed that they had always held that the sacrament was consecrated by the words of the Lord alone, and that they would consider anyone who believed otherwise to be under anathema.

It was pressed that this be placed in the definition. They said this was not necessary — indeed, if it were placed, their Church would receive ignominy, as though they had previously held otherwise. Wherefore, since we had always been in agreement on this, a definition should be made only concerning what is in doubt.

At last our most holy Lord appointed certain deputies yesterday; and after many negotiations the Greeks said: *"In order that you may be certain of our belief, look at blessed John Chrysostom, who puts this matter plainly; and we are prepared to confess publicly that we hold, as you do, that the sacrament is consecrated by the words of the Lord alone."* Whereupon our most holy Lord, upon hearing this, agreed — so that what had never been in doubt might not appear to be called into doubt. Especially since other pontiffs who had attempted the reconciliation of the Greeks had asked nothing else of them except that they confess that the sacrament could also be consecrated in unleavened bread.

viii. The Primacy

The last difference was concerning the primacy, and this appeared more difficult in terms of human nature — because subjects readily deviate from their head. And in truth, up to now they had not thought rightly about the power of the Roman Pontiff, saying that he was head in the way a dean is head of a whole body. And having heard the Sacred Scriptures and the holy councils, the truth was seen: that the Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Peter. Then, by the disposition of divine goodness, it came about that the Greeks gave their assent according to the document given by the Latins.

They said at last that we should deliberate something concerning the patriarchal sees — namely that Constantinople should be second, etc. — as has been decided in the constitutions of the councils and in the Lateran Council, where Innocent **iii** presided and renewed the privileges of the patriarchal sees. All these things we reported to our most holy Lord, without whose permission nothing was attempted.

Our most holy Lord wishes to deliberate nothing in so weighty a matter without the knowledge of your fatherhoods; and for this reason he has caused your fatherhoods to be assembled. I shall read the summaries of the documents; afterward his Holiness and your lordships will deliberate.

These Greeks are pressing strongly for their departure; and since they will pass near the Turks, it is expedient to travel safely. And although our most holy Lord provides galleys, nonetheless — so that they may travel more safely — it seems to those same people that they should go with the Venetian galleys, and that the Emperor should go to build up the people quickly. For if the news were to reach an uninformed population without the arguments having been heard, it would be dangerous. Wherefore it seems that his wish should be granted. I shall read the document — which is not yet in the form of a decree, because it will be made in the person of our most holy Lord; the decree will be made afterward.

ANDREAS. When these things had been said, the Cardinal read the first document: *"Since in this holy council"* etc. — as it is written above.

ANDREAS. When this had been read, the second document followed: *"We define"* etc.

ANDREAS. When this had been read, the third follows in this manner: *"Likewise in unleavened bread"* etc.

CARDINAL. Before the session takes place, the Greeks will come to this place and will confess that the sacrament is confectioned by the words of the Lord alone.

ANDREAS. When these things had been said, he read another in this manner:

CARDINAL. *"Likewise, if those who have truly repented"* etc.

ANDREAS. When this had been read, another was read in this manner: *"We define"* etc.

ANDREAS. All of these, as noted above, we have already transcribed; and so it is not fitting to occupy the pages with them again.

CARDINAL. Most holy Father and most reverend fathers. These things have been accomplished by the deputies. Now let your Holiness decree as it shall seem good to your Holiness, with the counsel of these fathers. And your Holiness can render the highest thanks to God that in our time what has been done — which from the time of the Apostles to this day has scarcely been done to such a degree — has come to pass: and it has brought back to the faith of the Roman Church as many, or more, than we Latins ourselves number.

SPEECH OF THE POPE, 27 JUNE 1439

POPE. Venerable brothers and sons. You have heard what our son the Cardinal of Santa Sabina said, and the negotiations and labors and conclusions, and how he urges that we ought to give thanks to our Lord, for we have seen what our predecessors wished to see and did not see. After many labors, nearly all things that had seemed hopeless have come to the desire of the Roman Church, by God alone working, who works where He wills and when He wills. The Greeks hasten the expedition, and we both must and wish to do the same. I believe that all of you, by your wisdom, ought to join with us and give thanks to God, and it seems fitting that from each estate some persons be appointed who may draw up a decree, so that a session might be held on the day of the Apostles Peter and Paul — this we most earnestly desire, and the Greeks likewise, and it would be good. I hear that it has been CCCC XXXVII years since we first desired the same. If there is anyone who wishes to say something, let him speak; and thanks must be given to those who have labored.

POPE. At the twentieth hour let all the estates assemble.

ANDREAS. The promoter announced it thus.

LUDOVICUS. What does this word "estates" signify?

ANDREAS. What was done in the council I have recorded separately in another treatise, from which you will more fully understand the form of the council and what this word means; but to give you a brief account: at the beginning, when the council was convened at Ferrara, while the fathers were deliberating on the

proceedings — whether to proceed by nations or by deputations — since, if individuals had met together as one body, conclusions would never have been reached in the matters discussed, it was decided that the council should be assembled in three estates: the cardinals, archbishops, and bishops; and a second estate of abbots and other regulars; a third estate of learned clerics, those holding dignities in cathedral churches, and graduates in theology, canon law, and civil law. And it was concluded that the will of any estate should be considered present if two out of three parts of that estate were in agreement; and nothing was to be done in a conciliar manner without the prior assent of each estate. And so, in order that anything might be concluded in a conciliar manner, it was necessary that the established form should lend its authority. At the twentieth hour each person assembled in his own estate, and each estate appointed four deputies who would reduce the opinions from the written ballots into a single bull; once these were elected, the assemblies of the estates were dissolved for that day.

LUDOVICUS. Why was it not ensured that so great an interval of time did not intervene, since these conclusions had been reached on the fourth of July?

ANDREAS. The intention of all had been that everything would pass without difficulty, but eight days intervened, with our deputies and those of the Greeks meeting twice each day; for there were differences in the wording, and thus so many days passed. At length the fathers assembled in the presence of the Supreme Pontiff on the fourth of July, and a general congregation was held in the apostolic palace, where, with all in attendance, the most reverend Cardinal of Santa Sabina began to address the fathers with these words.

SPEECH OF JULIAN CESARINI, CARDINAL, 4 JULY 1439

CARDINAL. A brief address must be made, reverend fathers. From the day on which you all convened, today is the eighth day. Four deputies were appointed for each estate, who were to meet with the deputies of the Greeks to draw up the decree; the fathers met each day, both in the morning and in the evening. At last, this morning the decree was read in San Francesco in Greek and in Latin, and all the deputies remained satisfied; therefore let it be read.

POPE. Read it.

ANDREAS. The decree was read by Lord Thomas, subdeacon, as you will hear below; and when it had been read, in the form and manner which we shall note hereafter, the Supreme Pontiff began to speak in this way.

SPEECH OF THE POPE, 4 JULY 1439

POPE. You have heard the decree read, and thanks must be given to our most high God for so great a grace, that so many thousands of peoples should acknowledge the truth, from which they had turned away for CCCC XXXVII years and more. Now let us render thanks to God. You see the labors of the deputies, and they ought to be rewarded with praise by all of us. I could not have known to ask more from the Greeks, for we have obtained what we sought and requested. After this matter of faith, other things remain to be done, and it is to be hoped that in the others God will grant prosperity and will make us one, just as in this matter He has made us all one. This decree, since it agrees with the written ballots, is hereby approved by unanimous consent of all, approved by the law itself. On Monday, which will be the octave of the most blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, in the cathedral church, where we shall celebrate, we shall hold the session.

ANDREAS. Once these things had been set forth, all were given leave to depart. On the following day, the fifth of July, at a late hour, all the Latin fathers having been summoned by special mandate, the Greeks came to the apostolic palace, where, in the presence of the Supreme Pontiff, the Metropolitan of Nicaea addressed the Latin fathers with these words.

DECLARATION OF BESSARION CONCERNING THE CONSECRATION OF THE MOST HOLY EUCHARIST, 5 JULY 1439

NICENUS. Most blessed and most holy father, and you, most reverend cardinals, and all other most reverend lords and fathers here present. Since in our preceding congregations, among other discussions concerning the differences between us, a doubt arose regarding the consecration of the divine sacrament of the Eucharist, and some have suspected that we and our Church do not believe that most precious sacrament to be consecrated by the words of our Lord — for this reason, most blessed father, we are here present before your holiness, with all these fathers

standing by who are on the part of the holy Roman Church. The greater part of all of us are personally present before your holiness; others are absent on account of bodily infirmity and the lateness of the hour. And now, most holy father, we are here to certify first your holiness, and then the other most reverend fathers, concerning this doubt, of which we speak briefly as follows.

It is well known, holy father, to your blessedness and to the other most reverend lords, that in the discussion and inquiry into the differences that arose, we made use of the authorities of sacred Scripture and of the holy fathers of the Church. For, most blessed father, recognizing and bearing in mind human frailty, we prefer to give credence to the authorities of the holy fathers rather than to human reasoning. The same rule which we have used in other matters, we use also in this point of hesitation. And since we hear from all the holy doctors of the Church — above all from that most blessed saint John Chrysostom — the saint himself saying that the words of the Lord are those which change and transubstantiate that bread into the body of Christ and the wine into the blood, and that those divine words of the Savior hold all the power of transubstantiation, we of necessity follow that doctor himself and his same teaching.

Furthermore, most blessed father, we are not ignorant that four things are required in the consecration of the most precious and venerable sacrament. **First**, holy father, the matter, which must be wheaten bread, whether leavened or unleavened, since it is truly consecrated with either. **Second**, that the minister be a priest who holds the priesthood from the Church according to the canons. **Third**, holy father, the form, which is these words of the Savior according to the teaching of the aforementioned Saint John. **Fourth**, most blessed father, the intention of the priest, that he have the intention of consecrating the bread set before him and the wine.

These things, most blessed father, we have said briefly and sufficiently on this question, for the certification of your holiness and of the other fathers. And since we have always been, are, and shall be of this teaching, we render your holiness most certain of it.

POPE. We have understood what has been said by our venerable brother the Nicenan, and although our mind held nothing different, it was nevertheless pleasing to hear what was expressed by word of mouth, for this is the teaching of

Saint John Chrysostom and of the other saints who came before and who followed after, and the holy Roman Church has followed and will always follow this teaching with the grace of God. It was pleasing to hear it, so that those who might have thought otherwise may be certain of your sound belief.

ANDREAS. When these things had been said, the Cardinal of Piacenza, who was then the first among the cardinals, said:

PLACENTINUS. We all have held and hold this with the grace of God; as we are in agreement on this, so shall we be in all other things.

ANDREAS. When these things had been said, the Nicenan spoke these words:

NICENUS. Through your blessedness and the solicitude of your holiness, all things have proceeded happily and all will proceed toward what is better, and with your blessedness presiding it is to be hoped that all will proceed happily, as the grace of the Holy Spirit has been seen to act in this holy work.

ANDREAS. When these things had been set forth, we all rose at the twenty-fourth hour.

PROMULGATION OF THE DECREE OF UNION WITH THE GREEKS, 6 JULY 1439

ANDREAS. On the sixth day, in the cathedral church, a session was held, with both Latins and Greeks present, in the order and manner set forth above in the pronouncement and declaration of the ecumenical council, although the celebration was more splendid by reason of the nobility of the city, the great multitude of the people, and the presence of the lords. For that church, which in size is not among the middling churches of Italy but among the greater ones, was so filled with a great multitude of people that a very large number of men had to stand outside the church, which was not able to hold them. The venerable assembly of fathers, as you will see in the subscription.

LUDOVICUS. Was there anything new or noteworthy at that celebration beyond the decree?

ANDREAS. Beyond the novelty of the new chapters of the faith contained in the decree, I observed nothing new, except that, just as the other Latin father-bishops approach the Supreme Pontiff to show him reverence by kissing the hem of his garment, so too did the Greeks do likewise, and they sang the hymn "Veni Creator Spiritus" (Come, Creator Spirit) in Greek with most sweet chant, and they received and venerated the Mass and all the ceremonies of the Latin Church with the greatest reverence and piety. The Mass was celebrated in the manner of the Roman Church by the Supreme Pontiff; when it was finished, and after the customary prayers and ceremonies which are accustomed to be performed at public sessions, the seat of the Supreme Pontiff was placed at the altar as is the custom, and with all these present — the Emperor of the Greeks and the other Greek fathers — the most reverend lord Cardinal of Santa Sabina first in Latin, and then the Archbishop of Nicaea in Greek, read the decree, the words of which were as follows.

DECREE

Eugenius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, for perpetual remembrance of the matter.

With the consent of our most beloved son John Palaeologus, illustrious Emperor of the Romans, and of the representatives of our venerable brothers the patriarchs and the others representing the Eastern Church, to the matters written below.

"Let the heavens rejoice and the earth exult." (Psalm 95:11) For the wall that divided the Western and Eastern Church has been removed from the midst, and peace and concord have returned through that "cornerstone Christ, who made both one," (Ephesians 2:14, 20) joining both walls with the most powerful bond of charity and peace, and uniting and holding them together in a covenant of perpetual union. And after the long cloud of grief and the dark and bitter gloom of prolonged discord, the bright ray of the longed-for union has shone upon all. "Let mother Church rejoice," who sees her sons, hitherto at strife with one another, now returned to unity and peace, and who, having wept most bitterly before at their separation, now gives thanks to almighty God with inexpressible joy at their wondrous concord. Let all the faithful everywhere throughout the world rejoice, and let all who bear the Christian name exult together with the Catholic mother Church. Behold, the Eastern and Western fathers, after a very long time of

dissension and discord, exposing themselves to the dangers of sea and land and overcoming all hardships, have gathered gladly and eagerly at this holy ecumenical council out of desire for the most sacred union and for the renewal of ancient charity, and they have not been frustrated in their intention. For after a long and laborious inquiry, at last by the mercy of the Holy Spirit they have attained that most longed-for and most holy union. Who then would be sufficient to render worthy thanks for the blessings of almighty God? Who would not be astounded at the riches of so great a divine compassion? Whose breast, even of iron, would not be softened by the greatness of such heavenly piety? These are utterly divine works, not the inventions of human frailty, and therefore they are to be received with extraordinary reverence and accompanied with divine praises. To you be praise, to you glory, to you thanksgiving, O Christ, fount of mercies, who have bestowed so great a good upon your spouse the Catholic Church, and have shown the miracles of your piety in our generation, so that all may declare your wonders. For God has granted us a great and divine gift. With our own eyes we have seen what many before us, though they greatly desired it, were unable to behold.

For the Latins and the Greeks, meeting in this most holy ecumenical synod, applied themselves with great diligence to discussing among other things that article concerning the divine procession of the Holy Spirit, with the utmost care and assiduous inquiry. Testimonies having been brought forth from the divine scriptures and from very many authorities of the holy doctors both Eastern and Western — some saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and others from the Father through the Son, all tending toward the same understanding though under different terms — the Greeks asserted that when they say the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, they do not say this with the intention of excluding the Son, but because it seemed to them, as they say, that the Latins were asserting that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as from two principles and by two spirations; and therefore they refrained from saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. The Latins, however, asserted that they do not say the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son with the intention of excluding the Father from being the fount and principle of all deity, namely of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, nor that what the Spirit receives from the Son was not received by the Son from the Father, nor that they posit two principles or two spirations, but only to assert that there is one single principle and

one single spiration of the Holy Spirit, as they have always asserted. And since from all of these things one and the same sense of truth is drawn out, they at last unanimously agreed and consented to the following holy and God-pleasing union, in one and the same sense and with one and the same mind.

In the name therefore of the Holy Trinity, Father and Son and Holy Spirit, with the approval of this holy universal Council of Florence, we define that this truth of the faith is to be believed and accepted by all Christians, and that all shall profess it thus: that the Holy Spirit is eternally from the Father and the Son, and has His essence and His subsistent being from the Father and the Son together, and proceeds eternally from both as from one principle and a single spiration.

Declaring that what the holy doctors and fathers say — that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son — tends toward this understanding, so that by this it is signified that the Son also is, according to the Greeks, the cause, and according to the Latins, the principle of the subsistence of the Holy Spirit, just as the Father is; and since all things that are the Father's, the Father Himself gave to His only-begotten Son in begetting Him, except to be the Father, this very thing — that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son — the Son Himself has eternally from the Father, from whom He also was eternally begotten.

We further define that the addition of the words "and the Son" to the Creed was licit and reasonable, for the sake of declaring the truth and under the pressure of necessity at that time.

Likewise, that the body of Christ is truly consecrated in wheaten bread whether leavened or unleavened, and that priests ought to consecrate the body of the Lord in either one, each according to the custom of his own church, whether Western or Eastern.

Likewise, "if those who are truly penitent have departed in the love of God before they have made satisfaction by worthy fruits of penance for their sins of commission and omission, their souls are cleansed after death by purgatorial punishments, and that to be relieved from such punishments the suffrages of the living faithful are of benefit to them, namely the sacrifice of Masses, prayers and almsgiving, and other works of piety which the faithful are accustomed to perform

for other faithful according to the institutions of the Church. And the souls of those who after receiving baptism have incurred no stain of sin whatsoever, as well as those who, after contracting the stain of sin, have been purged, whether in their bodies or when stripped of their bodies, as was said above, are straightway received into heaven and clearly behold God Himself, triune and one, as He is, yet one more perfectly than another according to the diversity of merits. But the souls of those who depart in actual mortal sin or in original sin alone straightway descend into hell, to be punished however with unequal punishments."

We likewise define that the holy apostolic see and the Roman pontiff hold the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman pontiff himself is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal Church, as is also contained in the acts of the ecumenical councils and in the sacred canons. Renewing furthermore the order handed down in the canons for the other venerable patriarchs, that the patriarch of Constantinople shall be second after the most holy Roman pontiff, third the Alexandrian, fourth the Antiochene, and fifth the Jerusalemite; with all their privileges and rights preserved.

Given at Florence in a public synodal session solemnly celebrated in the cathedral church, in the year of the Lord's incarnation one thousand four hundred and thirty-nine, on the day before the Nones of July, in the ninth year of our pontificate.

And they subscribed:

I, Eugenius, bishop of the Catholic Church, defining thus, have subscribed.

I, Anthony, bishop of Ostia, Cardinal of Bologna, affirm the above definitions to be true and Catholic, and have subscribed to them.

I, Branda, bishop of Porto, have subscribed.

I, Nicholas, Cardinal of Santa Croce, have subscribed.

I, Francis, Cardinal-priest of the title of San Clemente, have subscribed.

I, Angelotto, Cardinal-priest of the title of San Marco, have subscribed.

I, Julian, Cardinal-priest of the title of Santa Sabina, have subscribed.

I, Prosper, Cardinal-deacon of San Giorgio, have subscribed.

I, Dominic, Cardinal-deacon of Santa Maria in Via Lata, have subscribed.

I, Blasius, patriarch of Jerusalem, have subscribed.

I, Marcus, patriarch of Grado, have subscribed.

I, John, bishop of Morini, orator of the most illustrious prince the lord Duke of Burgundy and Brabant, have subscribed.

I, John, bishop of Nevers, orator of the same lord Duke, have signed and was present.

I, Bartholomew, archbishop of Split, have subscribed.

I, Fantino, archbishop of Crete, have subscribed.

I, Julian, archbishop of Pisa, have subscribed.

I, Andreas, archbishop of Colossae, have subscribed.

I, Nicholas, archbishop of Capua, have subscribed.

I, Louis, archbishop of Florence, have subscribed.

I, Latinus de Ursis [Orsini], archbishop of Trani, have subscribed.

I, Raymond, archbishop of Coneza, have subscribed.

I, James, bishop of Adria, have subscribed.

I, Peter, bishop of Padua, have subscribed.

I, Daniel, bishop of Concordia, have subscribed.

I, Anthony, bishop of Portugal, have subscribed.

I, Bartholomew, bishop of Valva, have subscribed.

I, Thomas, bishop of Hvar, have subscribed.

I, Christopher, bishop of Rimini, have subscribed.

I, Amicus, bishop of Aquila, have subscribed.

I, Peter, bishop of Digne, have subscribed.

I, John, bishop of Ferrara, have subscribed.

I, Valentine, bishop of Orte and Civita Castellana, have subscribed.

I, John, bishop of Rab, have subscribed.

I, Benotius, bishop of Fiesole, have subscribed.

I, Charles, bishop of Siena, have subscribed.

I, Andreas, Spanish-Portuguese bishop of Megara, have subscribed.

I, Charles, formerly bishop of Modena, have subscribed.

I, Nicholas, bishop of Tivoli, have subscribed.

I, Artholus, bishop of Grasse, have subscribed.

I, Lawrence, bishop of Achaea, have subscribed.

I, Zeno, bishop of Bayeux, have subscribed.

I, Louis, bishop of Treviso, have subscribed.

I, John de Mella, elect-confirmed of León, have subscribed.

I, William, elect-confirmed of Angers, have subscribed.

I, Angelo, bishop of Poreč, have subscribed.

I, Damian, bishop of Assisi, have subscribed.

I, Peter, bishop of Ausara, have subscribed.

I, Matthew, bishop of Zara, have subscribed.

I, Angelo de' Grassi, bishop of Ariano, have subscribed.

I, Peter, bishop of Massa, have subscribed.

I, Bartholomew, bishop of Cavalillon, have subscribed.

I, Robert de Adimari of Florence, bishop of Volterra, have subscribed.

I, Anthony, bishop of Cesena, have subscribed.

I, Donatus, bishop of Pistoia, have subscribed.

I, Scipio, bishop of Modena, have subscribed.

I, Christopher, bishop of Koron, have subscribed.

I, Andreas, bishop of Conversano, have subscribed.

I, Alexius, bishop of Chiusi, have subscribed.

I, Garcia, bishop of Tui, have subscribed.

I, Gonzalvo, bishop of Granada, have subscribed.

I, Aymericus, bishop of Monreale, have subscribed.

I, Baptist, elect of Chieti, have subscribed.

I, Nicholas, bishop of Tricarico, have subscribed.

I, John, elect of Agen, have subscribed.

I, John, elect of Ösel, have subscribed.

I, William, elect of León, have subscribed.

I, Andreas, bishop of Rossano, have subscribed.

I, Matthew, bishop of Cortona, have subscribed.

I, Julian, elect of Citara, have subscribed.

I, John, bishop of Convers, have subscribed.

I, Thaddeus, bishop of Acquata, have subscribed.

I, Peter Clerici, archdeacon of Troyes, ambassador of the lord Duke of Burgundy and Brabant, have subscribed.

I, Ambrose, general of the order of Camaldolese, have subscribed.

I, Gometius, abbot of Florence, have subscribed.

I, John de Ursis, of Farfa, have subscribed.

I, Anthony, abbot of Saint Caprasius, have subscribed.

I, Francis, abbot of Saint Leonard, have subscribed.

I, Frederick, abbot of Borto, have subscribed.

I, George, abbot of Fereallis, have subscribed.

I, Anthony, abbot of Alfiolo, have subscribed.

I, Bartholomew, abbot of Campi Fullonis, have subscribed.

I, Sepulcrus, abbot of Urano, have subscribed.

I, Angelo, abbot of the Sixth, have subscribed.

I, Pascasius, abbot of Santo Sepolcro, have subscribed.

I, Benedict, abbot of Cuneo, have subscribed.

I, James, abbot of San Salvi, have subscribed.

I, Aloysius, abbot of Saint Paul on the bank of the Arno at Pisa, have subscribed.

I, John, abbot of Tiro, have subscribed.

I, Daniel, abbot of Savigliano, have subscribed.

I, Benedict, abbot of San Pancrazio, have subscribed.

I, Francis, abbot of Santa Maria di Pancrano, have subscribed.

I, John Gianvantius, abbot of Ripoli, have subscribed.

I, Angelo, abbot of San Michele of Pistoia, have subscribed.

I, Nicholas, abbot of the monastery of San Modesto of Benevento, have subscribed.

I, James, abbot of San Salvatore di Fonzoe, have subscribed.

I, Anthony, abbot of Montepiano, diocese of Pistoia.

I, Peter, abbot of San Pietro of Florence.

I, M., abbot of Santa Maria di Diciano.

I, Santellemen, abbot of Bibona.

I, Lawrence, abbot of Culvos.

I, Frederick, abbot of the monastery of San Pantaleone of Lucca.

I, Lucas, abbot in the Alps.

I, Tonus Lucas, abbot of Patrariatensis.

I, James, abbot of the monastery of San Pietro di Massa.

I, brother John, abbot of the Holy Martyrs of Córdoba.

I, William, abbot of Saint-Sauveur of Bordeaux.

I, George, abbot of San Pietro of Gubbio.

I, Anthony, abbot of San Salvatore and San Vigilio of Siena.

I, abbot of Santa Maria di Morona.

I, abbot of Santa Gaude.

I, Gabriel, abbot of San Giacomo di Pontida.

I, Dionysius, abbot of Santa Maria de Sandin, diocese of Sées.

I, Timothy, abbot of Sant'Andrea of Mantua, have subscribed.

I, brother William, general of the Minors.

I, brother Gerard, general of the Augustinians.

I, Placidus, general of Vallombrosa.

Blondus.

Subscriptions of the Greeks

John Palaeologus, in Christ God faithful king and emperor of the Romans.

Anthony, humble archbishop of Heraclea, president of the most honored metropolitans and primate of all Macedonia, and locum tenens of the apostolic see of the most holy patriarch of Alexandria, Philotheus, patriarch of Alexandria, have subscribed.

Gregory, sacred monk, grand protosyncellos and spiritual father, and vicar of the apostolic see of our lord Philotheus, patriarch of Alexandria, have subscribed.

Isidore, archbishop of Kiev and all Russia, and locum tenens of the apostolic see of the most holy patriarch of Antioch, lord Dorotheus, affirming and defining, have subscribed.

Dositheus, archbishop of Monemvasia, locum tenens of the apostolic see of the most holy patriarch of Jerusalem, Joachim, following, have subscribed.

Dorotheus, archbishop of Trebizond, following, have subscribed.

Metrophanes, archbishop of Cyzicus, have subscribed.

Bessarion, by divine compassion archbishop of Nicaea, following, have subscribed.

Macarius, archbishop of Nicomedia, have subscribed.

Methodius, humble archbishop of Lacedaemon, have subscribed.

Ignatius, archbishop of Tarnovo, following, have subscribed.

Dorotheus, archbishop of Mytilene, locum tenens of the archbishop of Side, following, have subscribed.

Damian, archbishop of Wallachia, and locum tenens of the archbishop of Sebasteia, have subscribed.

Joasaph, humble archbishop of Amaseia, have subscribed.

Nathanael, archbishop of Rhodes and the Cycladic islands, have subscribed.

Callistus, archbishop of Dristra, following, have subscribed.

Matthew, archbishop of Melnik, following, have subscribed.

Gennadius, archbishop of Ganos, following, have subscribed.

Dositheus, archbishop of Drama, following, have subscribed.

Bessarion, archbishop of Nicaea, by written mandate subscribed and signed by Manuel, grand sacristan, Chrysococces the deacon, whose deposition I here indicate by underwriting, showing that he agrees with us in all things and consents, and that he follows all of us who are here.

Theodoricus, grand skeuophylax, Xantinopolus, deacon, have subscribed.

Michael Balsamon, grand chartophylax, archdeacon, have subscribed.

Silvester Syropoulos, grand ecclesiarch and dikaiophylax, have subscribed.

George Capadotius, prothedicus, that is, chief procurator, deacon, have subscribed.

Constantine, first presbyter and vicar of Wallachia, have subscribed.

Moses, sacred monk, ecclesiarch of the venerable and sacred royal monastery of the Great Lavra of the Holy Mountain, and its locum tenens, have subscribed.

Dorotheus, sacred monk, vicar of the venerable and sacred Holy Mountain of the great monastery of Vatopedi, have subscribed.

Gerontius, sacred monk, formerly prior of the venerable sacred royal monastery of Christ the Almighty, have subscribed.

Athanasius, abbot of the monastery of Circumspecti, have subscribed.

Germanus, formerly abbot of Saint Basil, have subscribed.

Pachomius, sacred monk and abbot of Saint Paul, have subscribed.

ANDREAS. When all of these matters had been completed, on the twenty-sixth of August, the Emperor and the Greeks, having been solemnly escorted by the entire sacred College of Cardinals, departed from Florence on their return to their homeland, the cardinals accompanying them, and then three cardinals and many others escorting them through the territory of Florence; and with this, the longed-for conclusion of this most holy union was reached. You will receive these things, dearest brother, which, although they might have been recounted with more eloquence, could not have been recounted more rightly or appropriately; I have related them as they occurred, in the very words of those who spoke them, lest I be judged to have departed from the truth of what was done in favor of verbal ornament. Very many things that were done in private I have left for others to report who were present at them; what was done publicly I have set down with nothing altered from the matter itself. Farewell.

LUDOVICUS. And fare you well too.

THANKS BE TO GOD.

ON THE UNION WITH THE ARMENIANS

What was handed down concerning the faith of the Church and its sacraments by the Roman Church, with the approval of the holy council, to the peoples of the Armenians, through ambassadors who had requested these things.

With the preceding dialogues still fresh in writing, the death of our most dear and beloved Ludovicus was announced — news I received with all the greater grief because he perished in that tumultuous place and by an unexpected manner of death. Thirty hours were granted, troubled by plague, between health and death. For in that illness, the very moment when a person seems to be recovering more strongly, he is snatched away. If only time had been available so that, foreseeing death and having shared conversation, he might have been able to express the anguish of his intention — he would have acknowledged that what he had put forward in disputing with me about the primacy of the Church, he had said more as a disputant than as one asserting it to be true. For this reason, and because I was occupied with other public concerns, I was unable to send to him, forestalled by death, the things that had been discussed most solemnly with the Armenians. At another time I shall bring all those matters fully to light. For now I am content to append to this work on the Greeks only the mandate of the Armenian ambassadors and the form of the decree, so that the fruit of the translation of the council may be made clearly known to all, and so that those who oppose these matters may know what works they are obstructing.

From the time when the aforementioned affairs with the Greeks were concluded, up to the octave of November, a dispute was conducted with the Armenians concerning the sacraments of the faith, no less devoutly and acutely than with the Greeks, as I shall record the discussions in their proper time; and what they were like, each person of discernment will perceive from the content of the decree.

THE POWER of those who served in the office of this Armenian legation was of the following form:

I, Constantine, servant of the servants of our Lord Jesus Christ, having been constituted patriarch of Vagarsabad by the grace of God, write this letter and send it to the magnificent city of Caffa, and I send my blessing to all the people dwelling in Caffa: my faithful sons, and writing to you as one who glories in you, namely to my son the vertebet Sarchis, who sits in the seat of my person in Caffa, and to my firstborn son the archbishop, and to all the holy priests Stephen, Moses, and all the others, and to the noble citizens of Caffa — that is, Amirbeth, Tavacal, Chici, Amirbeth, Olbei, Aromtom, Andrew, and all the other burgesses — I write this letter with the power of the Holy Spirit, giving you blessing and greeting: May the

blessing of the holy cross and of Saint Gregory be upon you from the seat of our holiness. May God by His mercy free you from all temptations of the devil, both in spiritual and temporal matters. May God increase your sons and daughters and your goods.

Know, my most beloved sons — that is, my son Sarchis the vertebet, and you priests and burgesses — that Bishop Guanesius came to us and brought your letters from Caffa, and also those of the vicar of the Supreme Pontiff, and also the letter of the lord consul. We read them and were glad, because you had written concerning the union with the Roman Church. After I heard this, I gave thanks to God; it is by the grace of the Holy Spirit that this work has been begun; it is fitting for Christians to have unity and concord.

I, with our full authority, gave power to Sarchis the vertebet to go in my place and person, and to Marchos the vertebet, and to Thomas the vertebet, and to Joachim, bishop of Pera, that they go to the synod, and may the Holy Spirit enlighten them. And through the power of the Holy Spirit, just as Saint Sylvester and Saint Gregory were in concord, so may God bring you into concord in peace, love, and union; and just as Constantine and our emperor Tarthath had concord and pacts between them, so too may you confirm the acts of these men toward unity — and toward the deeds of these emperors we now incline ourselves; likewise, whatever the Holy Spirit shall illuminate in the holy synod, we are ready to obey it.

Written on the twenty-fifth day of the month of July, in the year of the Lord one thousand four hundred and thirty-eight.

LETTER OF THE REGENT OF THE CITY OF CAFFA TO THE SUPREME PONTIFF

Although the return of the Armenian people had been attempted very many times before, most holy and most blessed father, I was nevertheless afraid to undertake so great and so arduous a matter, in which I judged my powers of intellect could scarcely suffice; and I had resolved rather to stand back than to walk along unknown paths. But trusting in your holiness, whose merits demand that beneath its banner a singular and brilliant star should shine, and that the most holy mother Church should rejoice to be illuminated in this your time with new splendors of

union and holiness, I gathered strength and spirit, exhorted myself, and resolved to embrace the matter itself with the greatest solicitude and effort. In this endeavor, by diabolical instigation and preceding varied temptations, we suffered manifold stings, so that nearly everything was contrary to our wishes, and we often despaired of the work that had been attempted. Nevertheless, with that supreme Maker of all things working together with us and looking favorably upon your holiness — under which it was given that the unity of the faith should be sealed — we attained a good and perfect outcome, with sweat and the greatest vigils; and we have dedicated this work, so great that it shall not be erased from the memory of men through all ages, to your holiness.

I rejoice, most blessed father, that this unity has been revived in the times of your holiness, which had lain dormant in the time of your predecessors. For what could have happened more blessed, or more acceptable to God and to the whole Christian people, than this singular return of the Armenians? But it must be noted that, because of your holiness, amid the supreme labors and hardships by which you were beset, it has been granted that those who follow the Church may see that these works of yours are not human, but divine and flowing from God. For when I recognized that the supreme Author of all things had directed the eyes of holiness toward you and had established you in a reserved blessedness and glory, I dared to desire to become a sharer in your services; and trusting in the confidence of your holiness, I do not hesitate to seek from it that Roman senatorial dignity of yours, which I now humbly beg and request — not so much for my own merits, for which and for greater things I am indebted to almighty God and to your holiness, who acts as His representative on earth, but so that those who cultivate the worship of true religion may openly perceive that rewards await the good and the faithful who honor Christ, and that others may be provoked by such and similar hope toward the increase and favor of the holy Roman Church.

Receive therefore, most holy father, the legates of the Armenians, whom we send to the feet of your holiness with the full mandate and authority of their patriarch and of the whole of that nation — a mandate so ample that we understand no greater can be granted under any terms, which we have caused to be registered and judged it fitting to transmit to your holiness. These men are conducted by the vicar, Brother James, who, just as he was the principal co-adjutor of this great

illumination and return, it was fitting that he should also be their conductor; for he holds the hearts of those Armenians so firmly in his hands that they could go nowhere without him. This devoted man will explain the remaining matters more fully to your holiness — matters which I, lest I offend your most holy ears with inept speech, shall pass over. In the remaining matters touching the episcopate of this city, which your holiness commanded by letter, I have brought to execution; and if the aforementioned vicar of yours and I have decided to hold back in certain matters, we did so moved by good reason, awaiting henceforth in that business what your holiness shall have commanded to be done. May your holiness be well and happy, at whose feet I most humbly commend myself.

From Caffa, on the first day of December, in the year 1438.

Prostrate at the knees of the same holiness, Paul Imperiali, consul of Caffa and of the whole empire of Gazaria on the greater sea.

ANDREAS. When these letters had been presented to the holy synod, and the most reverend cardinals of Ostia, of Santa Croce, and of Santa Sabina, together with very many doctors, had been appointed by the Supreme Pontiff with the approval of the holy synod, and met almost without interruption day by day in the apostolic palace with the aforementioned Armenians — the aforementioned ambassadors were so instructed in the institutions of the holy Roman Church that, acknowledging the faith of the decree written below, they received it with the utmost devotion. This was confirmed in a public synodal session in the cathedral church on the twenty-second of November, and the form of this decree, promulgated through the voice of the bishop of Padua, is as follows.

The decree was received by the Armenian ambassadors from the Roman pontiff in the name of their patriarch and people.

Eugenius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, for perpetual remembrance of the matter.

"Exult in God, etc."

The text follows as in the Pontifical Letters, vol. **ii**, no. 224, pp. 124–135, but was made in a shorter redaction, and the subscriptions and Armenian text have been omitted.

